



WOKINGHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL

A Meeting of the **COMMUNITY AND CORPORATE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE** will be held in David Hicks 1 - Civic Offices, Shute End, Wokingham RG40 1BN **MONDAY 25 NOVEMBER 2019 AT 7.00 PM**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Susan Parsonage', with a long, sweeping tail stroke.

Susan Parsonage
Chief Executive
Published on 15 November 2019

The role of Overview and Scrutiny is to provide independent “critical friend” challenge and to work with the Council’s Executive and other public service providers for the benefit of the public. The Committee considers submissions from a range of sources and reaches conclusions based on the weight of evidence – not on party political grounds.

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.



WOKINGHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL

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

Guy Grandison (Chairman)
Paul Fishwick
Abdul Loyes

Ken Miall (Vice-Chairman)
Graham Howe
Barrie Patman

Shirley Boyt
Clive Jones

Substitutes

Andy Croy
Emma Hobbs

Carl Doran
Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey

Pauline Helliard-Symons
Caroline Smith

ITEM NO.	WARD	SUBJECT	PAGE NO.
31.		<p>APOLOGIES To receive any apologies for absence.</p>	
32.		<p>MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS To confirm the Minutes of the meeting held on 2 September 2019, the Minutes of the extraordinary meeting held on 24 September 2019 and the Minutes of the extraordinary meeting held on 30 October 2019.</p>	5 - 22
33.		<p>DECLARATION OF INTEREST To receive any declarations of interest.</p>	
34.		<p>PUBLIC QUESTION TIME 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 www.wokingham.gov.uk/publicquestions</p>	
35.		<p>MEMBER QUESTION TIME To answer any member questions.</p>	

36. None Specific **MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN 2020-23 - REVENUE BUDGET AND SPECIAL ITEMS** 23 - 42
To consider aspects of the draft 2020-23 MTFP, with a focus on growth and savings bids over £50k within Corporate Services and Customer and Localities Services. In addition, special items and bids under £50k are supplied
37. None Specific **WORK PROGRAMME** 43 - 50
To consider the work programme for the remainder of the 2019/20 municipal year

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

CONTACT OFFICER

Callum Wernham
Tel
Email
Postal Address

Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist
0118 974 6059
democratic.services@wokingham.gov.uk
Shute End, Wokingham, RG40 1BN

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE COMMUNITY AND CORPORATE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE HELD ON 2 SEPTEMBER 2019 FROM 7.00 PM TO 8.15 PM

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Ken Miall (Vice-Chairman, in the Chair), Paul Fishwick, Graham Howe, Clive Jones, Abdul Loyes and Barrie Patman

Other Councillors Present

Councillors: Pauline Jorgensen and Andrew Mickleburgh

Officers Present

Neil Carr (Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist), Andy Glencross (Assistant Director – Highways), Martin Heath (Traffic Management, Parking & Road Safety Team Manager), Geoff Hislop (Interim Parking Manager - Car Parks) and Callum Wernham (Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist)

11. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted from Guy Grandison and Shirley Boyt. Andy Croy was present as a substitute for Shirley Boyt.

12. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 17 June were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Vice Chairman in the Chair.

13. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

14. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no public questions.

15. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

There were no Member questions.

16. CIVIL PARKING ENFORCEMENT

The Committee received and reviewed a report, set out in agenda pages 13 to 24, which gave details of Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) within the Wokingham Borough between June 2018 and June 2019.

Andy Glencross (Assistant Director – Highways), Geoff Hislop (Interim Parking Manager – Car Parks), Martin Heath (Senior Specialist - Traffic Management & Road Safety) and Pauline Jorgensen (Executive Member for Highways and Transport) attended the meeting to present the report and answer any Member questions.

The report outlined that CPE had assisted in improving traffic flow within the Borough by challenging drivers' previous parking behaviours and increasing awareness by way of warning notices. The service had maintained, as expected, a cost neutral operating model by means of income from penalty notices and parking fees covering the cost of service operation.

The report stated that further improvements to the service were being considered, including introduction of CCTV enforcement at School Keep Clear areas and increasing the number of Civil Enforcement Officers to increase coverage across the Borough.

Wokingham Borough Council (WBC) embarked on a full replacement programme of its ticket machines, which was now in its final stages. The expectation was that there would be a significant reduction in lost patrol hours as a direct result of the warranty and maintenance agreement in place.

Country parks management had welcomed the introduction of CPE at their sites as the income derived from their car parks ensured that they were self-sustainable and could continue to provide excellent amenity space for residents at little or no cost to WBC. Since the introduction of CPE, country parks had seen an increase in customers paying for car parking of approximately 20%.

During the ensuing discussions Members raised the following points and suggestions:

- Specifically, how had the objectives of CPE been met? Officer and Executive Member response – CPE had been requested by residents as the police were not able to continually enforce restrictions. The set of objectives was continually evolving in order combat problems as they occurred. A target of 8,000 penalty notices had been set for the service, and in the last year approximately 14,000 penalty notices had been issued, achieving a cost neutral service. Up to this point, the scope of CPE had been relatively small to achieve a proof of concept, and the expansion of the service including CCTV enforcement at schools was being investigated.
- When could the proposed CCTV enforcement at School Keep Clear areas be expected to go live? Officer response – Subject to approval, the traffic orders would take approximately 3 months to go live with additional time required to procure the necessary equipment. In total, CCTV installation could be expected approximately 3 to 6 months following approval. A key component of the scheme was that once compliance at one school was nearly at 100 percent, the equipment could be quickly moved and redeployed to different school location.
- Why had the number of Parking Charge Notices (PCNs) not decreased over time? Officer response – There were a small number of frequent repeat offenders within the Borough. In addition, Civil Enforcement Officers targeted areas until relative compliance had been reached, after they reduced patrols in an area non-compliance tended to begin to rise again.
- Was there a seasonal trend in PCNs issued? Officer response – There was no seasonal trend and PCNs were issued consistently all year round. The biggest factor in PCN variances came from Officer availability, for example, staff leave or sickness. An increase to Civil Enforcement Officer numbers would help to allow for more consistent patrols year round. Officers were looking into proposals to employ an additional 6 Civil Enforcement Officers on a cost neutral basis.
- Any surplus made from CPE could also be used to improve highways, in addition to being put back into the service. Officer response – This was correct.
- What were the figures for average PCNs issued at each school? Officer response – These figures would be collated and provided to Committee Members shortly.

- What plans were there for the schools with no registered patrols? Officer response – Additional Civil Enforcement Officers and the introduction of CCTV enforcement would provide greater patrol coverage at schools across the Borough. If there were concerns regarding a particular school, Members were welcomed to contact the Car Parking Manager directly to investigate.
- What were the nature of parking infringements at Dinton Pastures County Park, and were the majority of these infringements taking place during the evening? Officer response – Parking infringements at Dinton Pastures were not irregular, for example infringements included not having a ticket, parking outside of bays and parking within a disabled bay. The introduction of the new ‘check in, check out’ system had reduced ticketing for overstays. Activity groups such as the Scouts had been given season tickets for their leading staff, with spares available for parents to use in special circumstances. In addition, there was a 10 minute grace period for pick up and drop off times for parents. Data regarding season tickets would be collated and provided to the Committee Members shortly, and Officers would investigate what data regarding timings of PCNs issued at Dinton Pastures was available and feed back to Committee Members.
- Why was Rose Street being allowed to return to a paper permit system? Executive Member response – WBC were trying to discourage the use of paper permits as a paper system costed more, was open to fraud and resale. However, the team was conscious that moving to an online system created obstacles for some residents, which was why there was a call centre service which would do the computer administration for the customer over the phone. Rose Street was being allowed to return to the paper system due to a particular need and specific concerns made by residents.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) Andy Glencross, Geoff Hislop, Martin Heath and Pauline Jorgensen be thanked for attending the meeting;
- 2) data regarding PCNs issued at each school be circulated to Members of the Committee;
- 3) the Committee be kept updated on the progress of CCTV enforcement installation at schools;
- 4) data regarding season tickets for activity group leaders at Dinton Pastures be circulated to Members of the Committee;
- 5) officers investigate what data is available regarding timings of PCNs issued at Dinton Pastures, and feedback their findings to Members of the Committee;
- 6) an annual update on CPE be scheduled on the Committee’s 2020/21 work programme.

17. BUS NETWORK REVIEW

The Committee received and reviewed a report, set out in agenda pages 25 to 38, which gave an overview of Wokingham Borough Council's (WBC's) ongoing bus network review, bus strategy and current bus provision.

Andy Glencross (Assistant Director – Highways, Martin Heath (Senior Specialist - Traffic Management & Road Safety) and Pauline Jorgensen (Executive Member for Highways and Transport) attended the meeting to present the report and answer any Member questions.

The report outlined that the draft bus network review was due to be released in late September 2019. The review would include an assessment of local, regional and national planning policy, data analysis of the current bus services and consideration of school transport services with future contracted public bus services.

The South of M4 Bus Strategy (SoM4) was secured as part of the planning permissions associated with the South of M4 development area. £2 million was to be made available by the University of Reading (applicant), as and when required, for the implementation of the bus strategy for 10 years following the first occupation on an occupational trigger point method. Phase 2a was underway with phase 2b expected between September and Christmas 2019.

The report stated that the primary issue for bus services in the Borough was congestion which caused variability to journey times on a day by day basis. A possible solution to this was the use of GPS tracking and real time operating systems within the buses, which would coordinate with the traffic light signals to allow smooth passage of the buses, albeit to the detriment of queuing on other arms of the junction.

During the ensuing discussions Members raised the following points and suggestions:

- Please clarify what was being done in anticipation of new occupations at housing developments? Officer response – Officers were trying to anticipate where new residents would be likely to travel to, and a concerted effort was being made to promote public transport within the borough, both for new and existing residents. A baseline service was needed for day 1 occupation and further services would be added via applicant funding based on occupation trigger points.
- When in 2020 would the Wokingham Town Centre bus services be re-tendered? Officer response – These timings would be researched and circulated to Committee Members.
- How would new residents be informed about public transport services? Officer response – Information would be included as part of a 'welcome pack' to each new build occupier, The MyJourney team would also target new developments with further information to ensure a sustainable service and a strong take-up.
- Could an estimate be provided as to when phases 3 and 4 of the SoM4 would go live? Officer response – Officers will get an estimated expected timeframe and feedback to Members of the Committee.
- Would the Local Travel Plan 4 (LTP4) be consulted through means other than a strictly online consultation? Officer response – LTP4 was going through various stages of

consultation and feedback processes. Officers would look into advertising the consultation in areas such as libraries, newsletters and possibly bus stops.

- Could more clarity regarding the suggested GPS and real time operating signalling solution be provided? Officer response – Signal timings would be used to allow for easy transition of bus services across the borough. This would come at a significant cost, as WBC's signalling assets would need to be upgraded. This system would be cloud based and would allow WBC more control of public bus services and their timings within the Borough.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) Andy Glencross, Martin Heath and Pauline Jorgensen be thanked for attending the meeting;
- 2) information regarding Wokingham Town bus service tendering be provided to Members of the Committee;
- 3) officers would retrieve an estimated expected timeframe for phases 3 and 4 of the SoM4 bus strategy and feedback to Members of the Committee;
- 4) the Committee be kept informed about the development of the LTP4.

18. WORK PROGRAMME 2019/20

The Committee received and reviewed a report, set out in agenda pages 39 to 48, which outlined the Committee's work programme for the 2019/20 municipal year.

The Committee were updated on the structure of the upcoming budget scrutiny items, which would include business cases for specific service areas, with the relevant Director(s) and Executive Members(s) being in attendance to present their specific service area's spending.

Clive Jones suggested that an item related to Wokingham Borough Council's property purchase group be added to the Committee's work programme.

Andy Croy asked that an item relating to the Woodley Town Centre regeneration project be added to the Committee work programme.

It was suggested that items relating to the Police and Fire services and the Community Safety Partnership be moved to the March Committee meeting.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) an item related to Wokingham Borough Council's property purchase group be added to the Committee's work programme, with a view of taking the item to the 25 November Committee meeting;
- 2) an item relating to the Woodley Town Centre regeneration project be added to the Committee work programme;
- 3) items relating to the Police and Fire services and the Community Safety Partnership be moved to the March Committee meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
COMMUNITY AND CORPORATE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
HELD ON 24 SEPTEMBER 2019 FROM 7.00 PM TO 8.35 PM**

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Guy Grandison (Chairman), Shirley Boyt, Paul Fishwick, Graham Howe, Clive Jones and Abdul Loyes

Presenting Executive Members

Councillors: John Kaiser

Officers Present

Graham Ebers (Deputy Chief Executive - Director of Corporate Services) and Callum Wernham (Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist)

Others Present

Lindsay Ferris, Michael Firmager, John Halsall, Adrian Mather and Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey

19. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted from Councillors Ken Miall and Barrie Patman.

20. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

21. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no public questions.

22. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

There were no Member questions.

23. MTFP 2020-23

The Committee received and reviewed a report, set out in agenda pages 5 to 14, which set out aspects of the draft 2020-23 Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) with a focus on the General Fund Revenue Account.

The Committee were advised that this meeting was the first in a series of budget scrutiny focussed sessions, with further detail including specific bids and associated business cases to be provided at future meetings.

John Kaiser, Executive Member for Finance and Housing, stated that involving scrutiny within the budget setting process was something that he had wanted to happen for some time. John added that should this process work well, it would aid in presenting a well-rounded budget with input from Members across the Council. John stated that much of the budget was necessary to provide statutory services, including Adult Social Care and children services. John commented that budgets of previous years did not necessarily reflect future budgets, as pressures in areas such as Adult Social Care were growing and were expected to continue growing. John stated that the budget was designed to deliver the Executive programme in addition to statutory services. John concluded by stating that this process was important as it allowed all Members and the public to see and understand both the budget setting process and budget proposals.

There was some discussion between John Kaiser and Clive Jones regarding the relationship between Scrutiny and the Executive in relation to budget scrutiny. John Kaiser commented that in his view this process would allow for Members from three of the four political groups within the Council an opportunity to review budget proposals and ask questions of Executive Members and Directors about their service areas including growth bids and savings proposals. John added that all Members and the public would have access to this information, and he hoped that scrutiny would be able to sign off a budget that had support from across the Council following detailed scrutiny. Clive Jones commented that in his view it was scrutiny's role to challenge assumptions and current and proposed spending levels to ensure that statutory services were maintained. Clive added that in his opinion this process did not constitute any form of approval of the ruling group's budget. Clive stated that he welcomed the introduction of this budget scrutiny process, and hoped that it would continue in future years.

Graham Ebers, Deputy Chief Executive – Director of Corporate Services, stated that this would be the first budget setting cycle that would include overview and scrutiny in his 20 years of being Wokingham Borough Council's (WBC's) Chief Finance Officer. Graham stated that this process would create an excellent opportunity for collaborative working, and he hoped that this process would allow the creation of the best budget possible within the context of reduced funding. Graham added that this meeting was designed to be a higher level discussion to identify how the Committee would work in future meetings, with future meetings including specific bids and detailed business cases to allow for detailed analysis.

Graham Ebers stated that WBC was the lowest funded Unitary Authority, and explained that a Unitary Authority had the responsibility to provide all services that a two tier authority would provide including Adult Social Care and Children's Services. Graham outlined that the headlines for the future Local Government Finance Settlement appeared positive, and Officers remained cautiously optimistic about these proposals. Graham stated that it was likely that there would be an overspend in this year's budget, which would be funded through reserves. Graham stated that this process was not unsafe as reserves were at a suitable level, although it would need to be addressed in future, and ongoing costs savings such as the £3m year on year savings from the 21st century project had taken away some pressures from WBC's finances and would continue to do so.

Graham Ebers stated that the growth proposal for Children's Services was in order to bring the service up to a 'Good' rating, which had not been achieved previously. Graham commented that around £500k of bids were proposed to provide substantial investments into roads and highways infrastructure. Graham stated that the budget was in a constant state of work in progress as it would be for all other Local Authorities and this was the beginning of the budget setting process.

During the ensuing discussions Members raised the following points and queries:

- How many growth bids over £50k would the Committee receive? Officer response – Approximately 30 growth bids of £50k or above would be presented, with values varying from £50k to much more significant sums of £1m and above.
- How were the proposed savings within Corporate Services going to be achieved? Officer response – Increasingly, Local Authorities were required to become more commercial and self-sufficient, with less reliance on Government funding. WBC would

explore a range of opportunities to generate income without penalising residents, in order to continue to fund other service areas without the need of cuts within their budgets.

- What challenges were facing Children's Services, and how did this compare to other local authorities, and what were the key strategic risks within this service area? Officer response – The pressures facing Children's Services were almost entirely a result of the massive spike in children going into the care of WBC within the past few years. WBC had seen a 243% increase in children within our care in a single year. This had subsequently increased costs due to the cost of child placements and the increased need to hire additional social care workers, in addition to an increased pressure on the Home to School Transport budget occurring across the Borough. Wokingham had seen a 'lag', when compared to many other Local Authorities whom saw an increase in children in their care prior to WBC, however the percentage increase for Wokingham was stark as the baseline of existing children in care was comparatively low. The key risks came from having appropriate funding levels to manage the increased caseload.
- Considering the figure was cumulative, why was the year 2 Council Tax base estimated to be £2.28m rather than the expected £3.6m? Officer response – The assumption took into account an expected slowdown in property building within the borough in year 2, and this was an area that required close monitoring.
- How would the large predicted savings in year two within Children's Services be achieved? Officer response – More detail would be provided for this in future meetings when specific bids and business cases were available. However, on a high level by heavily investing in year 1 costs could be brought down in the future. This would be achieved by investing in smarter and more efficient methods of working, and by hiring the right staff with the correct skillsets.
- What challenges were facing Adult Social Care, on a high level? Officer response – The demand facing the service was constantly increasing, and certain families with a high level of need were moving in to the Borough. There was a fragile provider market currently, and uncertainty on a national level had led to increased costs for suppliers. The Executive Member for Finance and Housing added that there was also uncertainty as to how Central Government would decide which parts of Adult Social Care sat amongst the trusts, this was a big macro issue which was difficult to predict.
- Would the new homes bonus be expected to continue going forward? Officer response – There would be a fundamental spending review of Local Government Finances organised by Central Government, and it was likely that the new homes bonus would be unrecognisable after this review.
- What were the key challenges as a result of the 19/20 funding gap? Officer response – The main issue was that this overspend would roll over into the next budget as it was funded through reserves.
- How had preparations to address the recently declared climate emergency been reflected within the budget proposals? Officer response – This would be addressed within the detail provided at future meetings.
- How low would the general reserves need to go to become a real concern for Officers? Officer response – Historically, below a level of £6m would start to become

uncomfortable for Officers. The general reserves were always the focus of budget risk analysis exercises to monitor spending.

- How would the percentage of business rates kept by WBC be changing in the future? Officer response – This was almost impossible to predict, and much of the potential for change would be driven by how Central Government assessed needs, for example deprivation and socio-economic factors with a local authority. WBC currently kept 21% of business rates, which could be reduced to 10% with negative RSG, and a worst case scenario could see WBC receive 0% business rates. The only way WBC could mitigate any reductions was to become more commercial and self-sufficient.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) Graham Ebers and John Kaiser be thanked for attending the meeting;
- 2) Business cases, front sheets and bids for each service area be provided to the Committee along with their upcoming agenda papers;
- 3) Executive Members be invited to future budget scrutiny Committee meetings;
- 4) Service Directors be invited to future budget scrutiny Committee meetings;
- 5) The Committee be kept updated regarding any substantial changes to the draft MTFP.

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
COMMUNITY AND CORPORATE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
HELD ON 30 OCTOBER 2019 FROM 7.00 PM TO 9.00 PM**

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Guy Grandison (Chairman), Shirley Boyt, Paul Fishwick, Graham Howe, Clive Jones, Abdul Loyes and Barrie Patman

Executive Members Present

Councillors: Parry Batth (Executive Member for Environment and Leisure), UllaKarin Clark (Executive Member for Children's Services), John Kaiser (Executive Member for Finance and Housing) and Charles Margetts (Executive Member for Adult Social Care)

Other Councillors Present

Councillors: Pauline Helliard-Symons, Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey, Chris Bowring and Malcolm Richards

Officers Present

Carol Cammiss (Director of Children's Services), Neil Carr (Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist), Graham Ebers (Deputy Chief Executive - Director of Corporate Services), Francesca Hobson (Flood Risk Manager), Jim Leivers (Children's Services Consultant), Matt Pope (Director of Adult Services) and Callum Wernham (Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist)

Others Present

Phiala Mehring (Vice Chair of the National Flood Forum)

24. APOLOGIES

An apology for absence was submitted from Councillor Ken Miall.

25. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

A declaration of interest was submitted from Councillor Graham Howe on the grounds that he was the Deputy Executive Member for Children's Services. Graham stated that he would not participate in any discussions or voting related to the Children's Services bids.

26. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no public questions.

27. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

There were no Member questions.

28. FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT UPDATE

The Committee received and reviewed a report, set out in agenda pages 5 to 8, which gave an update on the progress made with the Lead Local Flood Authority's (LLFA) duties under the Flood and Water Management Act (FWMA) 2010 during 2018/19.

Parry Batth (Executive Member for Environment and Leisure) and Francesca Hobson (Flood Risk Manager) attended the meeting to answer Member queries and present the report.

The report focussed on 8 key areas of work for the LLFA, these being:

1. Completion of a surface water management plan for Shinfield;
2. Maintenance of the Section 21 asset register;
3. Delivery of capital drainage schemes;
4. Drainage revenue works;
5. Commenting on planning applications in relation to flooding and drainage;
6. Development of a natural flood risk management scheme for the Lower Loddon;
7. Collaboration with the University of Reading;
8. Designation of additional flood defence structures.

The report outlined that the primary responsibility of the LLFA was to manage the coordination of surface water and groundwater flood risk in order to protect residents from flooding. A successful grant funding application to DEFRA enabled the LLFA to complete a flood risk management scheme to the south of Church Lane in Shinfield. This work was being carried out on third party land and involved the creation of a 250m ditch and a 190m bund to protect properties on Church Lane from surface water flooding. In future, Officers would be carrying out surface water management plans for all Towns and Parishes at risk of surface water flooding within the Borough.

The Section 21 asset register had been updated during 2018/19, which provided a database of features or structures within the Borough that, in the opinion of the Authority, could affect flood risk. Officers across the Council had access to the register via a mapping system, and part of the information had been made publically available to allow residents to report faults with individual assets across the Borough.

Officers had delivered a number of capital drainage schemes in 2018/19, including at Wilderness Road, Kentons Lane and Gypsy Lane. During 2018/19, Officers were expecting to deliver capital drainage schemes for Pound Lane, Pepper Lane, Jouldings Lane and Barkham Ride.

Over 40,000 gullies had been emptied by Wokingham Borough Council's (WBC's) contractor in 2018/19 as part of the annual gully cleansing programme. Silt levels had been recorded within the gullies to allow officers to develop a risk based approach to gully cleansing going forwards. In addition, 1,215 drainage problems had been responded to on the highways network after being reported by residents.

During 2018/19, the Flooding and Drainage Team had provided consultation responses to 460 planning applications, which had helped to ensure that the most appropriate drainage strategies were being implemented by developers. This had, in turn, contributed to a reduction of surface water flood risk across the Borough.

A preliminary design was being developed by officers to investigate the feasibility of delivering a natural flood risk management scheme to the south of the M4, to contribute to a reduced risk of flooding to the highways network and properties along the Lower River Loddon.

Officers had been working and collaborating with a number of students at the University of Reading on water related studies. This had provided WBC with more accurate and detailed information regarding flood risk and water quality across the Borough. This collaboration was expected to continue and develop further going forwards.

Officers had formally designated a number of additional features and structures within the Borough during 2018/19 which could have an impact of flood risk should significant changes be made to them. The benefit of designating these structures for the LLFA was that the owner would be unable to change the feature/structure without previous consent. Any successive owners would also be made aware that the feature/structure was significant in terms of flood risk.

In the ensuing discussion Members raised the following points and queries:

- How were new build houses and developments managed in terms of assessing potential flood risk? Officer response – Any structure that could pose a significant flood risk could be designated under the flood and water management act, which gave the LLFA emergency powers and meant the owner could not change the structure without the consent of the local authority. The Flooding and Drainage Team routinely responded to major planning applications and worked with developers to minimise their impact of flood risk within the Borough.
- How was WBC's strategy towards gulley cleansing being altered? Officer response – Contractors were now measuring the percentage of silt build-up when a gulley was being routinely cleansed. This would provide data to allow contractors to target gullies which had a higher level of silt build-up more regularly, which would reduce issues where a 'problem' gulley could become blocked.
- What measures were being put in place to relieve root infiltration issues? Officer response – The Wokingham Borough had 100's of kilometres of pipes within its network, which made it incredibly difficult to have a cleansing programme for the pipe network. Officers were looking at capital funding bids for schemes to maintain and clean the pipe network in future. There was potential to put measures in place to protect existing pipes, however, it was usually more effective and efficient to replace an existing pipe with more substantial infrastructure.
- Did WBC charge residents for sandbags when they were required? Officer response – WBC never charged residents for sandbags and currently had a good stock of sandbags for emergency situations. It was, however, the residents' responsibility to dispose of the sandbags when no longer required. Officers worked with residents in flood prone areas to identify measures they could take to protect their property from potential flooding.
- Had the amount of planning application consultation responses sent by the Flooding and Drainage Team increased in recent years? Officer response - The number of planning application consultation responses sent by the Flooding and Drainage Team had significantly increased when compared to previous years. In 2016, new obligations were put in place for the team to respond to surface water flood risk for planning applications. The Flooding and Drainage Team had increased from one to five officers in recent years, which had enabled consultation responses to be sent for both major applications and a number of householder applications.
- How did WBC work with the Environment Agency (EA) on a collaborative basis? Officer response – As the LLFA, WBC met with the EA on a monthly basis to look at issues within the Borough. WBC also worked closely with the EA when responding to planning application consultations.

- Did the Flooding and Drainage Team have any influence in planning policy, for example when a resident paved over their front garden to provide additional parking? Officer response – An Executive sub-strategy was agreed in 2017 which provided a set of conditions regarding planning policy within the Borough relating to flood risk management. There was a lot of weight behind this sub-strategy and the team worked with householder applicants to ensure that the conditions were followed.
- What was being done to address flooding in Lower Earley? Officer response – A flood risk management plan was being developed, which would cover all of Lower Earley Way. This scheme was similar to the scheme delivered in Shinfield. This was taking some time as a bid had been placed to secure capital drainage funding, and this process was inherently lengthy.

Phiala Mehring, Vice Chair of the national Flood Forum, was invited by the Chairman to offer comment on the issues raised during the meeting. Phiala praised the work of Francesca Hobson and the whole of the Flooding and Drainage Team at WBC, citing their in depth knowledge and compassion for the communities they served. Phiala stated that in the shadow of climate change, more funding was required to address and rectify flooding issues and risks. Phiala added that more lateral thinking was required to address flood risk, and cited examples of London Boroughs which had conducted green space audits to identify areas where sites, such as schools and playgrounds, could be ‘greened-up’ or where rain gardens could be installed to capture rain water. Phiala stated that Local Authorities needed to strive to engage with communities and seek out an appetite to improve their environment.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) Parry Batth, Francesca Hobson and Phiala Mehring be thanked for attending the meeting;
- 2) The Committee continue to work with the Flooding and Drainage Team to achieve effective flood risk management within the Borough;
- 3) An update on flood risk management progress during 2019/20 be scheduled to the Committee in 12 months’ time.

29. MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN 2020-23: REVENUE BUDGET

Graham Howe declared an interest in this item, specifically the Children’s Services bids, by virtue of the fact that he was the Deputy Executive Member for Children’s Services. Graham stated that he would not take part in any discussions or voting related to the Children’s Services bids.

The Committee considered a report, set out in agenda pages 9 to 46, which detailed all revenue growth and savings bids over £50k for Children’s Services, Adult Social Care, Corporate Services and Customer and Localities Services. The Committee were advised to focus on the bids for Children’s Services and Adult Social Care, with a view to analyse the bids for other service areas at the Committee meeting scheduled for 25 November 2019.

UllaKarin Clark (Executive Member for Children’s Services), Carol Cammiss (Director of Children’s Services), Jim Leivers (Children’s Services Consultant), Charles Margetts (Executive Member for Adult Social Care), Matt Pope (Director of Adult Services), John

Kaiser (Executive Member for Finance and Housing) and Graham Ebers (Deputy Chief Executive – Director of Corporate Services) attended the meeting to answer Member queries.

Graham Ebers stated that around 80% of the revenue budget went towards care services, with around 10% – 12% of the budget going towards waste services. This left a small amount of the budget to provide discretionary services which were much valued within the community, for example park and countryside services. Graham added that the format for this year's budget scrutiny would provide a new level of transparency around the budget and the budget setting process, with all growth and savings bids over £50k being publically provided.

During the ensuing discussion Members raised the following points and queries:

- What impact would the delay of national budget have on Wokingham Borough Council's (WBC's) budget? Officer response – This would create a certain level of uncertainty within WBC's budget, however there was always fluidity within any budget setting process in order to deal with emerging pressures. It was not yet clear what this would mean for the Local Authority settlement, and WBC would continue to make representations to Central Government for a fair settlement.
- When would equality impact assessments (EQIAs) be carried out for specific proposals? Officer response – All EQIAs would be carried out at the appropriate time in the process, before implementation and after major considerations had been made. There was little point in carrying out the EQIAs at this stage in the process as proposals were subject to constant change and awaiting consultation responses. Where required, all EQIAs would be completed prior to the Budget Council in February 2020.
- Relating to agenda page 16, what would the £245k growth bid be used for in relation to increased capacity to deliver Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) services? Officer response – This growth would enable an increase in staffing, including 2 educational psychologists and 3 case managers. This struck a sensible balance between service need and budgetary pressure.
- Relating to agenda page 19, how would the savings of £330k be realised within Children's Services system capitalisation? Officer response – A lot of work was being conducted to capitalise existing software licences to convert them to a revenue saving. This process would ensure that the licences that were currently being used were being properly utilised.
- What was the target case load for a Children's Services case worker? Officer response – An average case load of 15 cases was being targeted, and it was important that staff had a manageable case load going forward. The current caseload for each staff member was between 18 and 23 cases, and this number was already significantly smaller than it had been in recent years.
- Relating to agenda page 18, when would the additional places at Addington School go towards reducing WBC's Home to School Transport (HTST) budget? Officer response – It was hoped that savings within the HTST budget would be realised by April 2021 as a result of the additional places at Addington.

- Relating to agenda page 14, what was being done to address the significant number of locum staff within Children's Services? Officer response – Due to the nature of the social worker market nationally, there was not a great appetite amongst locum workers to become permanent members of staff. WBC regularly had conversations with a number of locum staff whom we would like to become permanent, explaining the benefits of joining WBC. A recruitment specialist had recently been employed to begin to promote and market Wokingham in order to attract more permanent social workers to WBC.
- Relating to agenda page 18, what specific issues were there related to the 'mid-phase challenge'? Officer response – This was related to the efficiency strategy that was being developed, which was currently mid-way through. For example, HTST was hugely reliant on school spaces at local schools, with the plan being to open 3 more primary schools within the Borough in the future which would reduce the pressures on transporting primary aged children. This would not, however, reduce the pressures on Special Educational Needs related travel.
- Relating to agenda page 16, how long had WBC not been compliant with our statutory SEND responsibilities? Officer response – There had not been enough in-Borough SEN school places to meet the needs of SEND pupils within the Borough, the number of which had significantly increased in the past 3 to 4 years. There were currently ongoing discussions with the Department for Education about opening a 3rd in-Borough SEN school to provide up to 75 SEN spaces. This was in addition to the 7 resource bases attached to mainstream schools within the Borough. WBC were expecting to be fully compliant with our statutory obligations within 7 to 8 weeks, in no small part due to the extra 4 staff that were currently processing Education, Health and Care Plans in a timely manner.
- Relating to agenda page 17, how did WBC end up with the lack of funding within the current Safeguarding and Quality Assurance arm of the Directorate? Officer response – When Children's Services split from People Service's a portion of this funding was lost. This growth bid was required to make sure that this area was not funded by special items going forward.
- What was being done to reduce the budgetary pressures within HTST? Officer response – This was an area of significant budgetary pressure, with 30 – 35 additional HTST places being offered this school year. Savings could, in future, come from looking at how some students with an Education, Health and Care Plan were transported, as not all of these pupils required a taxi for transportation for example.
- Relating to agenda page 21, how many children would be affected by the savings within the review of therapy services? Officer response – No service reduction would take place, and no less therapy would be offered to children as a result of these savings. The proposed savings were about reducing the costs of commissioning and not a reduction of service. Both the Director and Executive Member were clear that they would not sign off to a reduction in therapy delivery to children.
- Relating to agenda pages 21 and 22, how confident were officers of the combined proposed savings of £500k over 2 years within Children's Services? Officer response – This figure was believed to be achievable, given the caveats of having an increasing number of children in care within the Borough.

- Had the Executive Member for Children’s Services been briefed on all of the proposed growth and savings bids? Executive Member and Officer response – There was a close working relationship between the Director and the Executive Member for Children’s Services, and all proposals had been agreed, and signed off, in collaboration between the Executive Member and the Director of Children’s Services. The final sign off had occurred following the publication of this agenda.
- Relating to agenda page 29, how would technology enabled care provide savings within Adult Social Care? Officer response – An example of a saving in this area was the use of epilepsy bracelets, which would alert staff when a service user was having a seizure. This would lead to less stress on staff having to constantly monitor service users and allow a better overall outcome for both staff and service users. It would also require less overall staff to monitor service users, leading to a saving. Savings in this area would come from using simple and effective technological tools to make both staff and service users overall experience better.
- Relating to agenda page 26, had these figures taken into account the full pressures of a changing demographic? Officer response – Yes, these figures included all current and predicted demographic changes, which would lead to an increase in demand from the service, hence the need for a growth bid to continue to provide these services.
- Relating to agenda page 27, how long had WBC not been meeting the needs required under the Care Act? Officer response – Issues in this area had been occurring for approximately 12 months. It was predicted that WBC would be meeting its duties under the Care Act by March 2020.
- Relating to agenda page 29, had similar savings within the Adult Social Care Pathway Redesign already been achieved this year? Officer response – Yes, approximately a £300k saving had been realised this year, and the figures presented within the bid were what was expected to be delivered in the coming years.
- Relating to agenda page 30, were the proposed savings within the Optalis review achievable? Executive Member and Officer response – Yes, this was a relatively large contract totalling approximately £8.2m, and Officers were confident of making a 12% saving over the life of this contract. There would be no reduction in frontline staff numbers as a result of these savings, and savings would be realised from streamlined governance and marketing.
- How were savings monitored in year? Officer response – Revenue monitoring was carried out throughout the financial year which tracked all revenue spending and savings. Revenue monitoring reports were presented to the Executive quarterly.
- Relating to agenda page 32, how would savings be realised by properly utilising funding streams? Officer response – WBC needed to make sure that its partners, such as the NHS, were meeting their legal obligations, and that WBC were not funding services in areas where its partners had authority.
- Relating to agenda page 34, was this level of grant funding realistic in its continuation? Officer response – This was a prudent valuation of the level of grant funding in this area, and enabled the service to plan for the long term.

- Had the Executive Member for Adult Social Care been briefed on, and subsequently signed off, all submitted bids? Executive Member response – Yes, discussions had been ongoing between Officers and the Executive Member for several weeks, with a final sign off having occurred since the publication of the agenda.
- What was being done to help address the transition for service users between Children’s Services and Adult Social Care? Officer response – There was a high level improvement plan in this area which was already funded, and was overseen by the Director of Children’s Services and the Director of Adult Services. The transition team would be moving back to Adult Social Care in the immediate future. There was always a problem in this area due to the gap in eligibility when transitioning between the two services.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) UllaKarin Clark, Carol Cammiss, Jim Leivers, Charles Margetts, Matt Pope, John Kaiser and Graham Ebers be thanked for attending the meeting;
- 2) The Committee be kept updated should any of the published bids within Children’s Services or Adult Social Care change significantly;
- 3) Bids related to Corporate Services and Customer and Locality Services be considered at the meeting of the Committee on 25 November 2019;
- 4) Directors and Executive Members related Corporate Services and Customer and Locality Services be invited to the November Committee meeting.

30. WORK PROGRAMME

The Committee considered a report about its work programme, set out in agenda pages 47 to 54, which outlined the proposed forward programme for the Committee for the remainder of the 2019/20 municipal year.

The Committee were advised that the property investment group item, originally scheduled for the 25 November meeting, would be better placed on the agenda for 6 January. The final months of the calendar year were a busy time in the investment cycle and a delay of just over a month would allow for a more complete report to be submitted. In addition, adding this item to the January agenda would tie in well with the scheduled capital and special items figures to be provided as part of the Committee’s budget scrutiny work at the January meeting.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) The proposed forward plan for the remainder of the 2019/20 municipal year be agreed;
- 2) The item related to the property investment group be moved to the meeting on 6 January 2020.

Agenda Item 36.

TITLE	Medium Term Financial Plan 2020-23: Revenue Budget and Special Items
FOR CONSIDERATION BY	Community and Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 25 November 2019
WARD	None Specific;
LEAD OFFICER	Deputy Chief Executive - Graham Ebers

OUTCOME / BENEFITS TO THE COMMUNITY

Financially sustainable Council and value for money services in accordance with priorities.

RECOMMENDATION

To consider the report and identify areas of productive exploration.

The Committee are advised to focus on Corporate Services and Customer and Localities Services bids over £50k for this meeting, however special items and under £50k bids are included within the report.

SUMMARY OF REPORT

The previous O&S budget meeting focussed on revenue bids within Children's Services and Adult Social Care over 50k. Business Cases for growth and savings items with a value of £50k and over for Corporate Services and Customer and Localities Services, are now provided for consideration at Appendix A, as agreed within the scrutiny process.

In addition, figures relating to special items and bids under £50k are attached at Appendix B.

Background

The Council annually undertakes its budget setting process for all its financial activities including General Fund Revenue Account (funded primarily by Council Tax), Housing Revenue Accounts (funded by tenants), Schools (funded by Government) and Capital (funded by various capital resources).

An overview of these funds is provided in the MTFP, last approved by Full Council in February 2019.

Analysis of Issues

The appended business cases supply all revenue and growth bids over £50k within Corporate Services and Customer and Localities Services.

In addition, figures relating to special items and bids under £50k are attached at Appendix B.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE RECOMMENDATION

The Council continues to face severe financial challenges over the coming years as a result of reductions to public sector funding and growing pressures in our statutory services. It is estimated that Wokingham Borough Council will be required to make budget reductions of approximately £20m over the next three years and all Executive decisions should be made in this context

	How much will it Cost / (Save)	Is there sufficient funding – if not quantify the Shortfall	Revenue or Capital?
Current Financial Year (Year 1)	See other financial implications	Y	R
Next Financial Year (Year 2)	See other financial implications	Y	R
Following Financial Year (Year 3)	See other financial implications	Y	R

Other financial information relevant to the Recommendation/Decision

There are no financial implications associated with the scrutiny process, however, the full MTFP, when submitted to Council in February 2020, will have to represent a balanced budget.

Cross-Council Implications

This is in respect of budgets across all Council services.

Public Sector Equality Duty

Equality Impact Assessments have not been undertaken at this stage, however, they shall be required before specific proposals are agreed and implemented. Where appropriate and where required, Equality Impact Assessments shall be undertaken prior to the budget Council in February 2020, with all Equality Impact Assessments being completed prior to implementation.

Reasons for considering the report in Part 2
N/A

List of Background Papers
MTFP 2019-22

Contact Graham Ebers	Service Corporate Services
Telephone No 6557	Email graham.ebers@wokingham.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Revenue Budget Setting 2020/21 to 2022/23

Directorate: Corporate Services

Bid No.	Type	Bid Name	Cumulative movement from 19/	
			2020/21	2021/22
CORP.S.1	Savings	Income generation in excess of financing costs - Commercial Properties	(£700,000)	(£1,200,000)
CORP.S.2	Savings	New Income generation in excess of financing costs - Commercial Properties	(£1,040,000)	(£1,500,000)
CORP.S.3	Savings	Wokingham owned houses	(£200,000)	(£400,000)
CORP.G.4	Growth	Economic prosperity & place resource	£50,000	£50,000
CORP.S.6	Savings	Enhancement of Cantley Park	(£100,000)	(£100,000)
CORP.S.7	Savings	Revenue impact of development of Crematorium with Wokingham Borough	£0	(£219,000)
27 CORP.G.9	Growth	Democratic Services	£30,000	£30,000
CORP.S.10	Savings	Grants to Town/Parishes phased out over 5 years	(£20,000)	(£20,000)
CORP.S.11	Savings	Audit Shared Service - Additional clients	(£20,000)	(£20,000)
		Total	(£2,000,000)	(£3,379,000)

Growth	£80,000	£80,000
Invest to Save	£0	£0
Savings	(£2,080,000)	(£3,459,000)
Special Item	£0	£0

Revenue Budget Setting 2020/21 to 2022/23

Directorate	Corporate Services
--------------------	--------------------

Bid Details

Bid Type	Savings	Permanent reduction in expenditure or increase in income budget
Bid Name	Income generation in excess of financing costs - Commercial Properties	
Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	This is the on-going full year effect of the current property investment programme, which is investing in commercial properties within the borough boundary and also outside of Wokingham Borough Council. It reflects the ongoing income from the property portfolio to date plus future acquisitions to the sum of the original capital bid of £100 million	
Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref	The portfolio is showing a net return of 2%. This is net of the cost of borrowing, a statutory provision for possible capital losses (MRP) and extra resource in the investment team. Income £500k p.a has already been budgeted for through previous MTFP versions. The amounts identified below are in addition to this.	
Impact if bid not successful	N/A - capital budget already agreed by Council.	
Preparedness for implementation of savings	Increased income already being delivered - expansion of portfolio will generate more income returns.	

Finance Information

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
		2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	£0	£0	£0
	Income	(£700,000)	(£500,000)	£0
<i>Cumulative movement from 19/20 budget</i>		(£700,000)	(£1,200,000)	(£1,200,000)

Sign Off

Service Manager	Damon Eames
Assistant Director	Bernie Pich
Director	Graham Ebers, Deputy Chief Executive
Lead Member Briefed	Yes

Revenue Budget Setting 2020/21 to 2022/23

Directorate

Corporate Services

Bid Details

Bid Type	Savings	Permanent reduction in expenditure or increase in income budget
Bid Name	New Income generation in excess of financing costs - Commercial Properties	
Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	This is the revenue impact of a new capital bid for a further £100m for the current property investment programme, which is investing in both commercial properties and private market sales/rentals of housing stocks.	
Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref	The portfolio is showing a net return of 2%. This is net of the cost of borrowing, a statutory provision for possible capital losses (MRP) and extra resource in the investment team. Income £500k p.a has already been budgeted for through previous MTFP versions. The amounts identified below are in addition to this.	
Impact if bid not successful	Loss of new revenue stream.	
Preparedness for implementation of savings	Governance already in place for the utilisation of the first £100m approved in 2018.	

Finance Information

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
		2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	£0	£0	£0
	Income	(£1,040,000)	(£460,000)	£0
<i>Cumulative movement from 19/20 budget</i>		(£1,040,000)	(£1,500,000)	(£1,500,000)

Sign Off

Service Manager	Damon Eames
Assistant Director	Bernie Pich
Director	Graham Ebers, Deputy Chief Executive
Lead Member Briefed	Yes

Revenue Budget Setting 2020/21 to 2022/23

Directorate

Corporate Services

Bid Details

Bid Type	Savings	Permanent reduction in expenditure or increase in income budget
Bid Name	Wokingham owned houses	
Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	This is increased income from the development of housing within the borough by the Council through its wholly owned subsidiary companies.	
Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref	The delivery plan is up to 1,000 homes over the next four years on a assumed RoI of 5%	
Impact if bid not successful	Subject to approval of capital bid and financing	
Preparedness for implementation of savings	Extra income will be delivered if the capital bid is approved and the programme proceeds to plan.	

Finance Information

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
		2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	£0	£0	£0
	Income	(£200,000)	(£200,000)	£0
<i>Cumulative movement from 19/20 budget</i>		(£200,000)	(£400,000)	(£400,000)

Sign Off

Service Manager	Nigel Bailey
Assistant Director	Nigel Bailey
Director	Graham Ebers, Deputy Chief Executive
Lead Member Briefed	Yes

Revenue Budget Setting 2020/21 to 2022/23

Directorate

Corporate Services

Bid Details

Bid Type	Growth	Permanent increase in expenditure or reduction in income budget
Bid Name	Economic prosperity & place resource	
Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	Additional resource to coordinate the councils response to the climate emergency goals recently announced by members 1 FTE post.	
Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref	Reference Climate Emergency motion which was approved at full council in July. Role will involve developing and monitoring the Climate Emergency Action Plan, carbon reduction activity across the council and the borough as well as developing and monitoring the carbon footprint of Wokingham Borough	
Impact if bid not successful	Slow programme. This role will involve bidding for funding for funds for carbon reduction initiatives - which will save the council energy costs. Not able to forecast exact amount at this stage	
Additional comments		

Finance Information

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
		2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	£50,000	£0	£0
	Income	£0	£0	£0
<i>Cumulative movement from 19/20 budget</i>		<i>£50,000</i>	<i>£50,000</i>	<i>£50,000</i>

Sign Off

Service Manager	Rhian Hayes
Assistant Director	Nigel Bailey
Director	Graham Ebers, Deputy Chief Executive
Lead Member Briefed	

Revenue Budget Setting 2020/21 to 2022/23

Directorate

Corporate Services

Bid Details

Bid Type	Savings	Permanent reduction in expenditure or increase in income budget
Bid Name	Enhancement of Cantley Park	
Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	Development of 3G pitch at Cantley Park, will increase revenue income within Leisure services	
Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref	Full business case is being developed. Dependent on receipt of Football Foundation grant	
Impact if bid not successful	If grant is not received, then delivery of additional income is unlikely to be achieved.	
Preparedness for implementation of savings	Benefits realisation will form part of the full business case.	

Finance Information

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
		2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	£0	£0	£0
	Income	(£100,000)	£0	£0
<i>Cumulative movement from 19/20 budget</i>		<i>(£100,000)</i>	<i>(£100,000)</i>	<i>(£100,000)</i>

Sign Off

Service Manager	Beverley Thompson
Assistant Director	Nigel Bailey
Director	Graham Ebers, Deputy Chief Executive
Lead Member Briefed	

Revenue Budget Setting 2020/21 to 2022/23
Directorate: Customer & Localities

Cumulative movement from 19/20

Bid No.	Type	Bid Name	2020/21	2021/22
C&L.G.1	Growth	Street Cleansing Contract	£111,000	£111,000
C&L.G.3	Growth	Public Protection Partnership	£40,000	£90,000
C&L.G.6	Growth	Waste & Recycling collection property growth	£50,000	£100,000
C&L.S.7	Savings	Highways and transport – service efficiencies	(£50,000)	(£50,000)
C&L.G.9	Growth	Revenue funding for highways capital investment	£500,000	£500,000
C&L.G.10	Growth	Creation of Assistant Director - Highways	£95,000	£95,000
C&L.G.11	Growth	Highways maintenance - carriageways and footways	£39,000	£78,000
C&L.G.12	Growth	Cessation of grant (Elevate)	£30,000	£30,000
C&L.G.13	Growth	Revenue implications of integrated transport capital scheme	£21,000	£42,000
C&L.G.14	Growth	Highway drainage increased maintenance costs due to additional network length	£15,000	£30,000
C&L.G.15	Growth	Highway structures - major refurbishments/strengthening	£10,000	£20,000
C&L.G.16	Growth	Winter service - increased maintenance costs due to additional network length	£10,000	£20,000
C&L.G.18	Growth	Systems	£0	£24,000
C&L.S.19	Savings	Land Charges revenue generation	(£20,000)	(£20,000)
C&L.S.20	Savings	Parking review - Residents Permit charges increased (growth in car parking income)	(£10,000)	(£10,000)
		Total	£841,000	£1,060,000

Growth	£921,000	£1,140,000
Invest to Save	£0	£0
Savings	(£80,000)	(£80,000)
Special Item	£0	£0

Revenue Budget Setting 2020/21 to 2022/23

Directorate

Customer & Localities

Bid Details

Bid Type	Growth	Permanent increase in expenditure or reduction in income budget
Bid Name	Street Cleansing Contract	
Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	The Council's Executive agreed to enter into a new contract for street cleansing with Volkerhighways effective April 2020 at an additional cost of £111k pa	
Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref	Edge Consultancy Report Jan 2019 and Executive Report -Award of Street Cleansing Contract to VolkerHighway July 2019	
Impact if bid not successful	The Street Cleansing service will not be delivered resulting in environmental and visual harm, degradation of the highway and reputational damage to the Council	
Additional comments		

Finance Information

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
		2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	£111,000	£0	£0
	Income	£0	£0	£0
<i>Cumulative movement from 19/20 budget</i>		£111,000	£111,000	£111,000

Sign Off

Service Manager	Peter Baveystock
Assistant Director	Clare Lawrence
Director	Sarah Hollamby, Director of Customer & Localities
Lead Member Briefed	

Revenue Budget Setting 2020/21 to 2022/23

Directorate

Customer & Localities

Bid Details

Bid Type	Growth	Permanent increase in expenditure or reduction in income budget
Bid Name	Waste & Recycling collection property growth	
Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	Waste collection is a statutory service and this bid is based on an approx £50 per new property per annum and is mitigated by residents Council Tax contributions.	
Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref	Based on estimated property growth of 1,000 new properties per annum. The adjustments are made based on properties liable to pay Council Tax.	
Impact if bid not successful	Ongoing budget shortfall	
Additional comments		

Finance Information

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
		2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	£50,000	£50,000	£0
	Income	£0	£0	£0
<i>Cumulative movement from 19/20 budget</i>		<i>£50,000</i>	<i>£100,000</i>	<i>£100,000</i>

Sign Off

Service Manager	Peter Baveystock
Assistant Director	Clare Lawrence
Director	Sarah Hollamby, Director of Customer & Localities
Lead Member Briefed	

Revenue Budget Setting 2020/21 to 2022/23

Directorate

Customer & Localities

Bid Details

Bid Type	Savings	Permanent reduction in expenditure or increase in income budget
Bid Name	Highways and transport – service efficiencies	
Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	Anticipated savings from 21C changes in Service Delivery and new Term Maintenance and Professional Services contracts.	
Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref		
Impact if bid not successful		
Preparedness for implementation of savings	Until the Service has completed a full year under the new contract arrangements (which includes a schedule of rates that differs in the way it is structured), there is some uncertainty over whether the Service will be able to achieve the required efficiencies.	

Finance Information

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
		2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	(£50,000)	£0	£0
	Income	£0	£0	£0
<i>Cumulative movement from 19/20 budget</i>		(£50,000)	(£50,000)	(£50,000)

Sign Off

Service Manager	Matthew Gould
Assistant Director	Andy Glencross
Director	Sarah Hollamby, Director of Customer & Localities
Lead Member Briefed	Pauline Jorgensen

Revenue Budget Setting 2020/21 to 2022/23

Directorate

Bid Details

Bid Type	Growth	Permanent increase in expenditure or reduction in income budget
Bid Name	Revenue funding for highways capital investment	
Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	To cover the interest costs to enable the borrowing required for the Wokingham Highways Investment Strategy Capital bid in 2019/20	
Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref		
Impact if bid not successful	The Council would be unable to deliver the step change level of Highways maintenance (as envisagd in the WHIS) and there would be a continued decline in the condition of the Wokingham Highways network.	
Additional comments	Whilst this is a revenue bid to support a Highways and Transport capital bid it would be more sensible to show this bid within Corporate Services as this is where the spending will actually occur.	

Finance Information

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
		2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	£500,000	£0	£0
	Income	£0	£0	£0
<i>Cumulative movement from 19/20 budget</i>		£500,000	£500,000	£500,000

Sign Off

Service Manager	Matt Gould
Assistant Director	Andy Glencross
Director	Sarah Hollamby
Lead Member Briefed	

Finance Use Only

Bid Ref No.	C&L.G.9
Cost Centre(s)	
Finance Specialist	

Revenue Budget Setting 2020/21 to 2022/23

Directorate

Customer & Localities

Bid Details

Bid Type	Growth	Permanent increase in expenditure or reduction in income budget
Bid Name	Creation of Assistant Director - Highways	
Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	Following approval at July Exec, this bid is to cover the costs of this decision.	
Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref		
Impact if bid not successful		
Additional comments		

Finance Information

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
		2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	£95,000	£0	£0
	Income	£0	£0	£0
<i>Cumulative movement from 19/20 budget</i>		<i>£95,000</i>	<i>£95,000</i>	<i>£95,000</i>

Medium Term Financial Plan

Special Items

Bid	2020/2021 £'000 Budget	2021/2022 £'000 Indicative	2022/2023 £'000 Indicative	Comments
Corporate Services				
Continuous Improvement Programme (CIP) - Estimated resource requirement to deliver sustainable organisational change	1,500	1,500	1,500	This is a resource requirement to enable the above improvement projects to be effected. Includes service specific, BA, HR and Fin support
Resource to lead on placement commissioning	90	90	0	Recruitment of lead specialist for placements to support Adults and Childrens
Community Safety Partnership + Wellbeing board project support	60	60	0	Resource to support partnership boards
Total	1,650	1,650	1,500	

Children's Services				
Create Edge of Care / Placement Support Service	300	300	300	Invest in new approach to prevent children entering care
Parenting Assessments	100	100	100	Targeted approach to parenting assessments, reducing reliance on independent provision
Children in Care CAMHS	100	100	100	Appointment of practitioner to provide specialist emotional and mental health support to Children in Care
Practice Assistants	200	200	200	Support social workers, allowing time to focus on professional activity
Childrens transformation	1,000	500	0	Resources to support the continuous improvement programme
Developing Social Work Apprenticeships	100	0	0	Scheme to develop "home grown" talent & achieve workforce sustainability
SEND Written Statement of Action Implementation	112	0	0	Improve SEND services, addressing Ofsted/CQC areas of concern
Review of Legal Costs	400	0	0	Continuation of joint arrangement while commissioned review undertaken on increasing legal costs across Children's
Learning, Achievement & Partnerships Complaints Officer	40	40	0	Resource to track and coordinate responses to complaints and recommend improvements
Total	2,352	1,240	700	

Medium Term Financial Plan

Special Items

Bid	2020/2021 £'000 Budget	2021/2022 £'000 Indicative	2022/2023 £'000 Indicative	Comments
Adult Social Services				
ASC transformation	1,000	500	0	Resources to support the continuous improvement programme
Transitions project support	35	0	0	Resources to support transitions
Total	1,035	500	0	
Customer and Locality Services				
One of implementation costs of Council Tax E Billing	50	0	0	Postage costs - increase in number of properties receiving billing
Additional work load for planing appeals	320	170	0	As per October 2019 supplementary estimate
AD Customer & Localities	20	0	0	One off costs due to long term staff absence
Planning Enforcement	100	100	0	To resource a significant increase in planning enforcement service requests and casework
PPP – proposal to subsidise the increase in the taxi license charge	18	0	0	Impact from unifying charges across 3 authorities
Total	508	270	0	
Total Special Items Expenditure	5,545	3,660	2,200	

2020/21 Medium Term Financial Plan - List of Bids - Under £50k

Growth

Directorate	Bid	2020/2021 £'000	2021/2022 £'000	2022/2023 £'000
Corporate Services	Democratic Services - Cessation of Government grant to conduct annual canvass (IER)	30	30	30
Customer and Localities Services	Waste and recycling - increase in property numbers	50	100	150
	Highways maintenance - carriageways and footways	39	78	117
	Loss of grant income (Elevate)	30	30	30
	Revenue implications of integrated transport capital scheme	21	42	63
	Highway drainage increased maintenance costs due to additional network length	15	30	45
	Highway structures -major refurbishments/strengthening	10	20	30
	Winter service - increased maintenance costs due to additional network length	10	20	30
	Systems – benefits assessments software	0	24	24

Savings

Directorate	Bid	2020/2021 £'000	2021/2022 £'000	2022/2023 £'000
Corporate Services	Leisure - Enhancement of Cantley Park	(35)	(100)	(100)
	Council Tax Reduction Grants to Town/Parishes phased out over 5 years – 20/21 final year	(20)	(20)	(20)
	Audit Shared Service - Additional clients	(20)	(20)	(20)
Children's Services	Admin efficiencies	(50)	(50)	(50)
Customer and Localities Services	Highways and transport – service efficiencies	(50)	(50)	(50)
	Land Charges revenue generation	(20)	(20)	(20)
	Parking review - Residents Permit charges increased	(10)	(10)	(10)

This page is intentionally left blank

TITLE	Work Programme 2019/20
FOR CONSIDERATION BY	Community and Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee – 25 November 2019
WARD	None Specific
LEAD OFFICER	Andrew Moulton, Assistant Director, Governance

OUTCOME / BENEFITS TO THE COMMUNITY

Effective Overview and Scrutiny helps to improve services, holds decision makers to account and engages with local communities. In so doing it helps to demonstrate that the Council and other public service providers are open and transparent and are delivering high quality, value for money services.

RECOMMENDATION

The Committee is requested to:

- 1) review its Work Programme for 2019/20 (Annex A);
- 2) prioritise the items in the work programme and allocate items to forthcoming meetings;
- 3) consider any other potential Scrutiny items for consideration during 2019/20;
- 4) consider currently scheduled items and extraordinary meeting dates as set out in Annex B.

SUMMARY OF REPORT

Effective work programming is a Member-led process aimed at shortlisting and prioritising issues of community concern together with issues arising out of the Council Plan and major policy or service changes. It aims to:

- reflect local needs and concerns;
- prioritise topics for scrutiny which have the most impact or benefit;
- involve local residents and stakeholders;
- be flexible enough to respond to new or urgent issues.

Each year the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee approves work programmes for itself and the Council's three Overview and Scrutiny Committees.

As this is the Committee's first meeting of the new Municipal Year the work programme is set out at Annex A for Members to consider and to prioritise items for future meetings.

Background

An effective Overview and Scrutiny function is underpinned by robust work programming. Effective work programming lays the foundations for targeted scrutiny of issues of local importance. It helps to ensure that Overview and Scrutiny adds value and makes a difference. Effective work programming helps to:

- prioritise issues for in-depth work where Overview and Scrutiny can make an impact and add value;
- reduce the need for “information only” reports;
- achieve a balance between pre-decision scrutiny, policy development and performance/budget monitoring;
- contribute at an earlier stage in the decision making process;
- increase public and stakeholder involvement in Overview and Scrutiny;
- retain flexibility in order to respond to urgent issues arising during the year.

The issues identified for consideration by Overview and Scrutiny should be of interest or concern for local residents and generate public interest and involvement in the Overview and Scrutiny process.

In order to generate ideas and involvement from local residents, community groups and stakeholders the Council’s website and social media are used to publicise the development of the work programme and to invite suggestions for items to be included.

Annex A to the report sets out items to be included in the Committee’s work programme for 2019/20. The Committee is requested to consider the list of items and to discuss its priorities for consideration at meetings in 2019/20.

Members may also wish to add further items to the work programme and consider how each item will be addressed, e.g. through reports to the Committee or the establishment of time limited Task and Finish groups.

As part of the work programming process, residents, community groups and Town and parish Councils were invited to identify issues to be considered in 2019/20.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE RECOMMENDATION

The Council continues to face severe financial challenges over the coming years as a result of reductions to public sector funding and growing pressures in our statutory services. It is estimated that Wokingham Borough Council will be required to make budget reductions of approximately £20m over the next three years and all Executive decisions should be made in this context

	How much will it Cost/ (Save)	Is there sufficient funding – if not quantify the Shortfall	Revenue or Capital?
Current Financial Year (Year 1)	£0	Yes	Revenue
Next Financial Year (Year 2)	£0	Yes	Revenue
Following Financial Year (Year 3)	£0	Yes	Revenue

Other financial information relevant to the Recommendation/Decision
None

List of Background Papers
None

Contact Callum Wernham	Service Democratic Services
Telephone No 0118 974 6059	Email callum.wernham@wokingham.gov.uk
Date 15 November 2019	Version No. 1.0

Annex A

Community and Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2019/20

1.	Reviewing the work of the Community Safety Partnership, the effectiveness of local policing and fire and rescue services
2.	Exercising the Council's flood risk management responsibilities by monitoring flood risk activities and partnership working with Towns and Parishes
3.	Scrutinising the Council's Budget development process and the draft Budget for 2020/21
4.	Scrutinising the Wokingham Town Centre regeneration programme, including the Safety and Financial Audits relating to the Market Place highways project
5.	Reviewing the effectiveness of the Council's partnerships with Town and Parish Councils and the voluntary sector
6.	Scrutinising service and policy developments relating to the Council's public facing services and its in-house support services
7.	Reviewing highways and transport issues including the new highways contracts, customer service, car parking and cycling facilities
8.	Reviewing the Business Case supporting the development of the Coppid Beech Park and Ride site
9.	Scrutinising the implementation of Civil Parking Enforcement across the Borough
10.	Scrutinising burial capacity across the Borough and the Council's plans to ensure future capacity
11.	Input into new policies through pre-decision scrutiny of draft proposals
12.	Appointing Task and Finish Groups as appropriate

DATE OF MEETING	ITEM	PURPOSE OF REPORT	REASON FOR CONSIDERATION	CONTACT OFFICER
6 January 2020 (Date moved from 13 January, now potential extraordinary meeting)	Budget Scrutiny	To scrutinise the Council's Budget setting process and the draft Budget for 2020/21	Work Programme	Bob Watson/Graham Ebers
	Property Investment group	To receive an update on the Council's Property Investment Group	Committee Request	Damon Emes
	Work Programme	To consider the work programme for the Committee for 2019/20	Standing Item	Democratic Services

DATE OF MEETING	ITEM	PURPOSE OF REPORT	REASON FOR CONSIDERATION	CONTACT OFFICER
13 January 2020 (If required)	Borough Design Guide	To receive an update on the development of the new Borough Design Guide.	Committee Request	Nigel Bailey
	Review of Burial Ground Capacity	To review the capacity of burial grounds within the Borough	Work Programme	Nigel Bailey
	Work Programme	To consider the work programme for the Committee for 2019/20	Standing Item	Democratic Services

DATE OF MEETING	ITEM	PURPOSE OF REPORT	REASON FOR CONSIDERATION	CONTACT OFFICER
23 March 2020	Police Service Update	To receive an update from the local police service.	Work Programme	Callum Wernham
	Fire Service Update	To receive an update from the local fire service.	Work Programme	Callum Wernham
	Community Safety Partnership	To receive an update from the Community Safety Partnership.	Work Programme	Narinder Brah
	Work Programme	To consider the work programme for the Committee for 2019/20	Standing Item	Democratic Services

This page is intentionally left blank