



WOKINGHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL

A Meeting of the **COMMUNITY AND CORPORATE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE** will be held virtually on **MONDAY 23 NOVEMBER 2020 AT 7.00 PM**

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

Susan Parsonage
Chief Executive
Published on 13 November 2020

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.

Note: The Council has made arrangements under the Coronavirus Act 2020 to hold this meeting virtually via Microsoft Teams. The meeting can be watched live using the following link: <https://youtu.be/FIUm2CHXozg>

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, learn, work and grow and a great place to do business

Enriching Lives

- Champion outstanding education and enable our children and young people to achieve their full potential, regardless of their background.
- Support our residents to lead happy, healthy lives and provide access to good leisure facilities to complement an active lifestyle.
- Engage and involve our communities through arts and culture and create a sense of identity which people feel part of.
- Support growth in our local economy and help to build business.

Safe, Strong, Communities

- Protect and safeguard our children, young and vulnerable people.
- Offer quality care and support, at the right time, to prevent the need for long term care.
- Nurture communities and help them to thrive.
- Ensure our borough and communities remain safe for all.

A Clean and Green Borough

- Do all we can to become carbon neutral and sustainable for the future.
- Protect our borough, keep it clean and enhance our green areas.
- Reduce our waste, improve biodiversity and increase recycling.
- Connect our parks and open spaces with green cycleways.

Right Homes, Right Places

- Offer quality, affordable, sustainable homes fit for the future.
- Build our fair share of housing with the right infrastructure to support and enable our borough to grow.
- Protect our unique places and preserve our natural environment.
- Help with your housing needs and support people to live independently in their own homes.

Keeping the Borough Moving

- Maintain and improve our roads, footpaths and cycleways.
- Tackle traffic congestion, minimise delays and disruptions.
- Enable safe and sustainable travel around the borough with good transport infrastructure.
- Promote healthy alternative travel options and support our partners to offer affordable, accessible public transport with good network links.

Changing the Way We Work for You

- Be relentlessly customer focussed.
- Work with our partners to provide efficient, effective, joined up services which are focussed around you.
- Communicate better with you, owning issues, updating on progress and responding appropriately as well as promoting what is happening in our Borough.
- Drive innovative digital ways of working that will connect our communities, businesses and customers to our services in a way that suits their needs.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMUNITY AND CORPORATE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Councillors

Guy Grandison (Chairman)	Emma Hobbs (Vice-Chairman)	Shirley Boyt
Paul Fishwick Abdul Loyes	Graham Howe Alison Swaddle	Clive Jones

Substitutes

Andy Croy Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey	Carl Doran Chris Bowring	Pauline Helliar-Symons Caroline Smith
--------------------------------------	-----------------------------	--

ITEM NO.	WARD	SUBJECT	PAGE NO.
49.		APOLOGIES To receive any apologies for absence.	
50.		MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS To confirm the Minutes of the meeting held on 2 September 2020 and the Minutes of the extraordinary meetings held on 22 September 2020, 13 October 2020 and 28 October 2020.	5 - 32
51.		DECLARATION OF INTEREST To receive any declarations of interest.	
52.		PUBLIC QUESTION TIME To answer any public questions. A period of 30 minutes will be allowed for members of the public to ask questions submitted under notice. The Council welcomes questions from members of the public about the work of this committee. 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	
53.		MEMBER QUESTION TIME To answer any Member questions.	
54.	None Specific	MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN 2021-24: REVENUE BUDGET To consider growth and savings bids over £50k for the Children's Services, Communities Insight and Change and Resources and Assets directorates.	33 - 68

55.

UPCOMING MEETINGS' WORK PROGRAMME

69 - 70

To consider the items scheduled for upcoming meetings

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

Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist

Email

democratic.services@wokingham.gov.uk

Postal Address

Shute End, Wokingham, RG40 1BN

MINUTES OF A VIRTUAL MEETING OF THE COMMUNITY AND CORPORATE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE HELD ON 2 SEPTEMBER 2020 FROM 7.00 PM TO 9.19 PM

Committee Members Present

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

Officers Present

Neil Carr (Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist), Andy Glencross (Assistant Director – Highways & Transport), Anne Hunter (Lead Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist), Aivaras Jasiunas (Senior Specialist, Asset Management) and Callum Wernham (Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist)

Executive Members Present

Pauline Jorgensen

20. APOLOGIES

An apology for absence was submitted from Keith Baker.

21. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 22 June 2020, and the Minutes of the extraordinary meeting of the Committee held on 27 July 2020 were confirmed as a correct record and would be signed by the Chairman at a later date.

Note A number of Members commented that several actions that required officer responses from the previous two set of minutes had not been circulated to the Committee. It was confirmed that officers were working on the responses to the actions, and a further reminder email would be sent to the respective officers.

22. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

A declaration of interest was submitted from Guy Grandison for agenda item 26, on the grounds that he was an employee for a company which provided online meeting solutions. Guy added that he did not work within the division which provided these solutions, and would take part in both the discussion and the voting for this item.

23. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no public questions.

24. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

There were no Member questions.

25. WOKINGHAM HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE

The Committee considered a report, set out in agenda pages 19 to 24, which set out the methodology behind how Wokingham's Highway network was maintained.

The report outlined the selection of roads to be included in the annual planned structural maintenance programme was based upon the UK Pavement Management System (UKPMS) which included annual Network Condition Surveys and our own internal design process (including site visits to check the condition survey scores and where required core sampling to establish the scale of intervention to be recommended). The report added that

this approach ensured that the annual structural maintenance programme was based on meeting the highest priority needs on WBC network within the funding available.

The report noted that the maintenance of the Wokingham's Highways network was made up of three main works streams: reactive maintenance (i.e. potholes etc.), winter maintenance (gritting), and planned structural maintenance (resurfacing, surface dressing and micro-asphalt). The UKPMS also prioritised which treatment was most appropriate for each location. Schemes were designed and drawings prepared based upon the network condition surveys, material testing and site walkover. The detailed design would then confirm the extent and scope of all resurfacing work, and would produce an updated estimated cost of each of the schemes. Once works were completed, contractors were tied into a defect period and a joint WBC and Contractor snagging inspection was undertaken to identify any remedial issues.

Pauline Jorgensen (Executive Member for Highways and Transport), Andy Glencross (Assistant Director – Highways and Transport), and Aivaras Jasiunas (Senior Specialist – Highways Asset Management) attended the meeting to answer any Member questions.

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

- What was the size limit for public reported defects? Officer response – The current limit was set at 1m², however a trial was underway to allow reported defects of up to 5m² to be reviewed and repaired.
- Where was surface dressing not recommended for use? Officer response – Surface dressing tended to be used in rural areas, whereas micro-asphalt was used in residential areas.
- Could Town and Parish Council's be formally approached on an annual basis when developing the rolling maintenance plan? Executive Member response – Town and Parish Councils were routinely in touch with Wokingham Borough Council (WBC) regarding the maintenance plan. The Executive Member stated that she would be happy to formally engage with them on an annual basis, in addition to the conversations that already took place.
- Could cycling routes be added as a priority within the rolling maintenance schedule? Officer response – Members were welcome to put a proposal to the Highways department and the Executive Member for consideration.
- When was the machine survey undertaken, and who owed this equipment? Officer response – The timeframe for the surveys to be completed was usually between 1st April and 1st October. The equipment was shared between the Berkshire Local Authorities.
- What were the lengths of time associated with the defect periods for surface maintenance work? Officer response – Surface dressing attracted a two year defect period, whilst micro-asphalt attracted a one year defect period.
- What percentage of the Wokingham Highway network was covered by the annual scan? Officer response – 100% of unclassified roads were covered, in addition to all A, B, and C roads, in addition to the full Wokingham footways network.

- How did micro-asphalt 'settle' once applied to a road? Officer response – Although vehicles may appear to not use the full width of a road, surfaces were embedded within the road consistently by vehicles.
- How long did micro-asphalt last on a residential road? Officer response – The usual expected usage for a micro-asphalt applied surface was between five and eight years. However, this process was only intended to extend the useful life of a surface, rather than making any structural changes.
- How proactive could Highways officers be with regards to surface maintenance? Officer response – Maintenance was carried out using a three year programme, and it was difficult to predict how an asset would behave, especially during the winter months. For the moment, works needed to be carried out on a priority basis. Year two and three of the programme was not publically released as this was subject to change. The Wokingham Highways Investment Strategy provided a long term plan for major projects, whereby major new roads were expected to be useful for between 20 and 30 years.
- Other Local Authorities were using recycled plastics to fill potholes, were WBC planning to adopt this approach? Officer response – There was a lot of innovation within pothole filling, however WBC were not currently using this approach. WBC were using a 'blow in tarmac' approach, which was less damaging to the environment than other methods.
- Could the officer presentation be circulated to all Members of the Council? Officer response – Yes, the presentation would be circulated to all Members.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) Pauline Jorgensen, Andy Glencross and Aivaras Jasiunas be thanked for attending the meeting;
- 2) Highways officers and the Executive Member for Highways and Transport seek to formally engage with Town and Parish Council's when developing the three year programme for surface maintenance;
- 3) The presentation shown on the evening by officers be circulated to all Members of the Council.

26. VIRTUAL MEETING REVIEW

The Committee considered a report, set out in agenda pages 25 to 30, which outlined the implementation of virtual Council meetings, and potential next steps moving forwards.

The report stated the initial options considered during the beginning of national lockdown, and the reasons behind why some options were not implemented. A standard Microsoft Teams meeting was chosen, and broadcast using the Open Broadcasting Software (OBS) facility. This allowed the 'flow' of a virtual meeting to be as close to that of a standard physical meeting as possible.

The report also outlined the next steps in Wokingham Borough Council's (WBC's) approach to holding Council meetings, including the possibility of hybridised meetings. Hybrid meetings would provide several logistical and technical challenges, however officer

were working to provide solutions to be able to run these meetings in the future, in a safe and professional manner.

The report stated a selection of achievements associated with the running of virtual meetings, including running the full schedule of meetings for the past few months, and the livestreaming of all public meetings on WBC's YouTube page.

Anne Hunter (Lead Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist) and Callum Wernham (Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist) attended the meeting to answer any Member queries.

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

- Should hybrid meetings go ahead, Members within the Council Chamber would need to see and hear the same as those within the virtual call. Officer response – This was agreed, and several tests would be carried out internally prior to any public meeting being held. Participants, whether virtual or within the Council building, would see and hear as close to the same content as was possible.
- The running of virtual meetings had meant several other benefits had occurred, including less heating of the Council offices for evening meetings. This in turn met the Council's climate emergency objectives, in addition to allowing participants to join the meeting from wherever was convenient. Hybrid meetings could present additional issues, including the cleansing of the Council chamber after meetings, additional travel to and from the Council offices, and additional heating of the building for evening meetings. Officer comment – Officers had been asked to look into the possibility of running hybrid meetings as there had been an appetite to do so from some Members. Hybrid meetings would not be ran unless they were safe for all attendees. Going forward, the plan was to webcast all meetings whether virtual, hybrid or physical. The positive climate benefits of holding virtual meetings were acknowledged by officers, in addition to the logistical benefits of being able to join a meeting from somewhere convenient.
- How many people could attend a hybrid meeting safely? Officer comment – Subject to ongoing government guidance, twenty people could be accommodated safely within the Council Chamber using a two metre separation distance. For now, only the Council Chamber could be considered for hybrid meetings due to the capacity of the room and the implementation of technology in order to enable hybrid meetings.
- Going forward, were there any plans to offer additional support to Members in terms of participating in virtual or hybridised meetings? Officer response – Any Members wishing to have additional training with Microsoft Teams could approach Democratic Services for a training slot to be arranged. Any Chairman who would be chairing a hybridised meeting would be offered additional training.
- Could the virtual meeting protocol be reinforced for attendees that were not following the procedure? Officer response – Attendees could be reminded of, and referred to, the virtual meeting protocol as agreed by Council.
- Was there the ability to mute participants and turn off participants' video during a meeting? Officer response – Democratic Services officers were able to mute participants that may have forgotten to turn off their microphone. Officers would

message a user who may have forgotten to turn off their video, asking them to do so. A last resort would be the removal of the participant from the call, and this would only occur after several reminders and persistent disruptive behaviour.

- Had an Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) been carried out with regards to the holding of virtual meetings? Officer response – An initial EQIA had been carried out, and was appended to the virtual meeting protocol report as agreed by Council. The EQIA identified a ‘no/neutral’ impact in 6 of the 9 protected categories, and a low impact in the remaining 3. Subtitles were available on the YouTube video to give viewers a good representation of the discussions at the meetings.
- Were there any voting modules associated with Microsoft Teams? Officer response – Currently, only the ‘hands up’ feature was integrated within teams to allow for voting.
- The Chairman proposed that a letter be written to the Minister for Local Government, asking that the regulations allowing for specific virtual meetings to take place be made permanent, at the discretion of each Local Authority. It was noted that some meetings may not be appropriate for virtual attendance in perpetuity, and these details could be agreed by each Local Authority at a later date should regulations permit. This proposal was agreed by the Committee. Officers commented that it was hoped that a consultation regarding virtual meeting regulations would be carried out by the Government.
- Regarding meeting broadcasting, how many officers were undertaking this task? Officer response – Originally, one Democratic Services officer undertook the broadcasting of all meetings. After a short time, a further two colleagues situated within the IT department have also been broadcasting Council meetings. The limiting factor was the required upload speed available at the homes of staff members. Many broadband providers were inundated with requests for upgrades and maintenance, making it difficult for staff members to upgrade their connection to the required level. It was hoped that further staff members would have the required upload speed in future.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) Anne Hunter and Callum Wernham be thanked for attending the meeting;
- 2) Members contact Democratic Services with any practical suggestions on how virtual meetings may be improved in the future;
- 3) Members continue to work alongside Democratic Services to enable effective Council meetings to be held;
- 4) A letter be sent to the Minister for Local Government, asking that the regulations allowing for specific virtual meetings to take place be made permanent, at the discretion of each Local Authority. The most suitable route for this communication, be that from the Committee, the Executive, the Council, or from the Chief Executive, would be explored outside of the meeting.

27. WORK PROGRAMME

The Committee considered their upcoming work programme, set out in agenda pages 31 to 36.

Officers commented that due to the number and detail of items coming to the extraordinary meeting on 22nd, it would be useful to place some approximate timings for each item, and to set aside time at the end of the meeting to form the Committee's thoughts on the issues discussed ahead of their contribution into the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee's report on the Council's initial response to the Covid-19 Pandemic.

The Committee were advised that the revenue bids for Children's Services and Place & Growth would swap due to the Directorships availability. For clarity, Place & Growth would be coming to the 28 October meeting, and Children's Services would be coming to the 23 November meeting.

It was suggested that work programme item 14, relating to scrutinising the Council's Housing Services to ensure that the needs of local residents and communities are being met, come to an upcoming meeting of the Committee. Officers commented that as Housing had only recently come to the Committee as part of Covid-19 response, it would be appropriate to ask officers for a briefing sheet to be shared with the Committee regarding this issue. If issues arose from the briefing sheet, the item could be put on the forward plan.

It was suggested that work programme item 15, relating to scrutinising the operation and performance of the Council-owned companies and shared service arrangements, come to an upcoming meeting of the Committee. Officers stated that the appropriate Services would be contacted with regards to these issues, and the Committee would be kept updated.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) Items scheduled for discussion on 22 September have approximate timings allocated, with time set aside to form the Committee's thoughts on the issues discussed ahead of their contribution into the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee's report on the Council's initial response to the Covid-19 Pandemic;
- 2) The change of dates for receipt of the revenue bids for Place & Growth (28 October) and Children's Services (23 November) be noted;
- 3) Housing officers be asked to provide a briefing sheet with regards to work programme item 14, with a view to have an item placed on the forward plan should issues be identified;
- 4) The appropriate Services be contacted with regards to work programme item 15, and the Committee be kept updated with scheduling of these issues at future meetings.

**MINUTES OF A VIRTUAL MEETING OF THE
COMMUNITY AND CORPORATE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
HELD ON 22 SEPTEMBER 2020 FROM 7.00 PM TO 10.10 PM**

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Guy Grandison (Chairman), Shirley Boyt, Paul Fishwick, Graham Howe, Clive Jones and Abdul Loyes. Pauline Helliari-Symons attended the meeting as a substitute.

Executive and Deputy Executive Members Present

Councillors: John Kaiser (Executive Member for Finance and Housing) and Michael Firmager (Deputy Executive Member for Environment and Leisure)

Officers Present

Dave Allen (Communications, Engagement & Marketing Manager), Nick Austin (Interim Assistant Director – Customer and Localities), Neil Carr (Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist), Joelle Cooper (Senior Specialist, HR), Graham Ebers (Deputy Chief Executive), Damon Emes (Head of Investments), Bernie Pich (Assistant Director – Strategic Property and Commercial Assets), Martin Sloan (Head of Service – Community Care Services), Sarah Swindley (Lead Specialist, HR) and Callum Wernham (Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist) and Callum Wernham (Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist)

28. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted from Oliver Whittle and Keith Baker.

Pauline Helliari-Symons attended the meeting as a substitute for Keith Baker.

29. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Declarations of interest were submitted from Abdul Loyes and Clive Jones for agenda items 33 and 36, on the grounds that they had volunteered for aspects of the community response. Both would engage in discussions relating to these items.

A declaration of interest was submitted from Paul Fishwick for agenda items 33 and 36 on the grounds that his wife had volunteered for aspects of the community response. Paul added that he would engage in discussions relating to these items.

30. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no public questions.

31. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

There were no Member questions.

32. PROPERTY INVESTMENT GROUP - COVID 19 IMPACT

The Committee considered a report, set out in agenda pages 5 to 14, which outlined the initial impacts to Wokingham Borough Council's (WBC's) property investment group as a result of the Covid-19 (C-19) pandemic.

The report outlined the basis for the Property Investment Group (PIG), including the origins of the group and decision making process. The report stated that the commercial investment fund represented about half of the Council's overall property business. Historically the Council's property exposure had been relatively modest compared to many

other local authorities but it had grown significantly in the last 5 years through delivery of our Regeneration and Commercialisation agendas. The Commercial Property Team was currently responsible for managing approximately £8.0m p.a. rental income split across the three key portfolios: Regeneration, Operational and Investment.

Around 75% of investments (approximately £3.3m per annum) were secured against institutional calibre tenants who were thriving at present. With all debt taken into account, WBC would see approximately a £400k per annum profit based only on institutional calibre tenants when secure debt was subtracted from the overall figures. Any surplus was used to fund other Council services. WBC's approach was validated by reputable external agencies who looked at assets and performance. WBC only invested for the long term, and the situation as presented within the report would only get better with the current holdings, as debt would reduce towards 0 over a 40 year investment period.

The PIG focussed on prudent investments, with tenants such as supermarkets. There was a targeted return of 5% on 1000 homes built by WBC over a 5 year period. This was an example of how the PIG could be used to regenerate parts of the Borough in a positive way, whilst allowing for a financial return to fund other Council services.

John Kaiser (Executive Member for Finance and Housing), Graham Ebers (Deputy Chief Executive), Bernie Pich (Assistant Director – Strategic Property and Commercial Assets), and Damon Emes (Head of Investments) attended the meeting to answer Member queries.

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

- Were smaller, independent units within the Wokingham Town centre covering the interest on the investment debt with their rents? In addition, how many units had to become vacant for the loan interest to no longer be covered by rental income? Officer response – At present, the rental income was covering the interest on the loans. It was felt that Wokingham deserved to be different with a variety of smaller firms within the town centre. Many other areas had an abundance of units, and Wokingham was currently bucking the trend in terms of vacant units. Specific information regarding vacancy rates and rental returns would be circulated to the Committee after the meeting.
- What was balance of the Council's rental income from the three different portfolios? Officer response received after the meeting –

WBC Commercial Property rental income (£p.a.) by portfolio, September 2020

Investment	£4.6m	50%
Regeneration	£2.9m	32%
Estates	£1.7m	18%
TOTAL	£9.2m	100%

Note: the report to O&S Committee included a figure of approx. £8.0m taken from the Council's Covid Rent policy document published March 2020. Since then the Investment portfolio has added one new asset with 6 new income streams, the Regen team has completed a number of new agreements/leases and the Estates team has continued to actively manage multiple income streams across four trading estates. The picture is constantly moving, in the right direction.

- Had WBC purchased, or were in the process of trying to purchase, any additional commercial units? Officer response – This was a commercially sensitive area, however officers were always looking to discharge the work of the policy.
- Was the food store property referred to on agenda page 8 classed as an institutional level client? Officer response – Careful covenant checks had been carried out, and in this instance the client had sold a variety of properties and leased them back to inject liquidity into the business.
- £85m had been invested to date, when would the remaining money likely be invested? Officer response – Officers were not under compulsion to commit further funds at any particular time, and the underlying Council policy was to enhance the Council's income stream.
- Was there any concern with regards to the uncertainty of the property market? Officer response – This was a complex area, and the circumstance of each business was taken into account on an individual basis.
- Were there any concerns regarding turnover based businesses providing rent? Officer response – Only one turnover based business was within the scheme, and this was the WBC owned Denmark Street car park. Although this was performing poorly at the moment, it was hoped that this would pick up in future.
- How many leases were at risk at present? Officer response – There were a number of portions of income streams of tenants under leases. The focus was on supporting tenants throughout this difficult period through to the other side.
- Was the scheme formed of investments that could withstand these difficult times? Officer response – In the context of the wider economy, the PIG and its investments were in a solid position, and officers were currently pleased and in a position to keep making positive forward steps.
- To what extent were retail units expected to sustain rents of pre C-29 levels? Officer response – High street units were key areas of concern, however people still wanted physical interaction with certain products and there was a place for these retailers post C-19.
- To what extent was increased Government interest in Local Authority investments a concern for WBC? Officer response – It was fair to say that the Government had a heightened interest in Local Authorities commercial investment schemes, as some Local Authorities had practiced a more extreme approach towards their investments. WBC practiced a safe and prudent approach towards our investments, and WBC were most certainly at the prudent end of all Local Authorities who were commercially investing. Most recently the Government had stipulated that you could not borrow outside of your boundaries. WBC were already borrowing using our own money, and there was not an intention to invest outside of the Borough in future. Investing within the Borough boundaries allowed WBC more control, and allowed development of schemes such as affordable housing for our residents.
- What was the debt recovery strategy for tenants who were not currently paying? Officer response – During the pandemic, it became unlawful for landlords to use conventional recourses to get tenants to pay their rent. This had severely reduced the

powers WBC had to encourage tenants to pay rent. The current approach involved creating and maintaining positive relationships with our tenants, whilst constantly assessing the risks. Currently, over 80% of rental collection was still being maintained.

- Could more detail be provided regarding the term “flight to quality”? Officer response – This term referred to investors moving towards food stores and logistics companies as very popular investments. These industries were at the core of WBC’s portfolio and this could be seen as a positive benefit at present.
- Should loan interest rates be increased, what effect would this have on WBC? Officer response – The public works loan board had increased rates by 1% overnight, however it was probable that in the long term the interest rates would go down. WBC were in a flexible position by having access to multiple sources of funding, in addition to our own internal funds.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) John Kaiser, Graham Ebers, Bernie Pich, and Damon Emes be thanked for attending the Committee;
- 2) Information regarding the balance of the Council’s rental income from the three different portfolios, and information regarding the regeneration income to debt query be included in the minutes;
- 3) The report, questions, and responses be used within the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee’s overall report on WBC’s initial response to the C-19 pandemic.

33. COVID-19 RESPONSE - STAFF REDEPLOYMENT

The Committee considered a report, set out in agenda pages 15 to 24, which outlined the staff redeployment process put in place as part of Wokingham Borough Council’s (WBC’s) initial response to the Covid-19 (C-19) pandemic.

The report stated that a cross directorate approach was taken, by quantifying and identifying the key needs within the organisation. A framework document was created, and the project was supported by the corporate leadership team. The key to the whole process was all directorates working together, whilst understanding the needs of each specific service and redeploying staff from service areas who had capacity. Training support was provided to staff prior to redeployment where required. At the peak, 107 members of staff were redeployed across the organisation, and going forwards WBC now had a framework and skills tracker in place should the need arise once more.

Graham Ebers (Deputy Chief Executive), Sarah Swindley (Lead Specialist, HR) and Joelle Cooper (Senior Specialist, HR) attended the meeting to answer any Member queries.

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

- The Committee wished to thank all members of staff who had been redeployed, thereby ensuring service continuity for WBC and its partners;
- Were there any plans to continue collaboration with third party organisations post C-19? Officer response – This was an area which officers were looking in to. During the

pandemic, WBC had fostered some really strong positive relationships, and this would be continued as part of WBC's continuous improvement programme;

- Were there any redeployed staff who may not return to their original role for some time? Officer response – There were currently 4 redeployed staff within the organisation, and officers were working closely to assess whether there was a longer term need, and how to resource that need. These areas would be looked at under the continuous improvement programme, and some permanent changes may be a positive outcome in the long term;
- How were the funds found for additional payments to staff operating in a role with a higher grade than that of their original role? Officer response – The budgetary areas were complex, and answers to issues such as this would be better answered during the Committee's annual review of the medium term financial plan;
- The more WBC could do to hold onto collaborative working, both internally and with our partners, the better the service that could be provided for our residents.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) Graham Ebers, Sarah Swindley and Joelle Cooper be thanked for attending the meeting;
- 2) The report, questions, and responses be used within the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee's overall report on WBC's initial response to the C-19 pandemic.

34. COVID-19 - COMMUNICATIONS AND ENGAGEMENT RESPONSE

The Committee considered a report, set out in agenda pages 25 to 32, which outlined Wokingham Borough Council's (WBC's) initial response with regards to communications and engagement to the Covid-19 (C-19) pandemic.

This report summarised how WBC sought to support the community through the pandemic with timely and targeted communications, including a focus on particular groups such as the elderly, the BAME community, and people with underlying health conditions. Methods of communication included social media, printed flyers, and direct contact with voluntary and community organisations.

David Allen (Communications, Engagement & Marketing Manager) attended the meeting to answer any Member queries.

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

- Why was the offer of printed flyer distribution via political parties discounted? Officer response – There was an issue with getting full delivery coverage of the Borough via these means. WBC were very grateful for all volunteers who helped out with delivery of the printed flyers. If possible, Royal Mail would be used in future as they were more consistent and had coverage of the entire Borough.
- What was the feedback from the communications placed in the local papers? Officer response – Local papers allowed for particular demographics to be targeted, who may otherwise be missed using other means such as social media and online

communications. All communications placed within local papers were also published online, to allow as many people as possible to receive the same information.

- Were there any potential changes to future communications based on lessons learned from the first wave of C-19? Officer response – In future, officers would endeavour to target particular groups of people. This could be achieved by working with specific organisations such as universities.
- It was noted that the Leader and Deputy Leader held regular briefings with opposition Group Leaders throughout the first wave. This was very useful and much appreciated, and was a different experience that seen in some other Local Authorities.
- It was noted that going forwards, WBC needed to be able to target younger demographics, perhaps by engaging with 6th forms and inform students why restrictions were being put in place and how people should be acting. Should a second wave fully take hold, it was noted that further efforts should be made to locally reach out to the elderly, BAME groups and vulnerable groups. Officer response – Throughout the national lockdown, improvements were made to the way WBC communicated with BAME and vulnerable groups of people. WBC had direct contacts within the BAME communities, and more written communications would be put in place moving forwards. Officers would look to improve communications with the elderly, and hope that the community would continue to look out for each other via a fostered community spirit.
- It was noted that WBC now had a list of approximately 4,500 clinically vulnerable individuals whom could be contacted when required.
- How many individuals from the BAME communities were within the 4,500 clinically vulnerable individuals? Officer response – Officers did not have ethnicity data on hand, however this would be looked into.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) David Allen be thanked for attending the meeting;
- 2) The report, questions, and responses be used within the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee's overall report on WBC's initial response to the C-19 pandemic.

35. COVID-19 RESPONSE - COMMUNITY SAFETY

The Committee considered a report, set out in agenda pages 33 to 40, which outlined Wokingham Borough Council's (WBC's) initial response with regards to the community safety response to the Covid-19 (C-19) pandemic.

The report outlined a range of issues, including domestic abuse, parks and open spaces, play areas, fly tipping, and bonfires in addition to a range of other issues and topics.

The report concluded that the national lockdown had presented a range of new and unexpected challenges, in addition to exacerbated issues traditionally seen within holiday periods. WBC would therefore continue to work with its partners on a range of challenges in order to deliver key services to residents.

There had been some frustrations regarding the understanding of what powers a Local Authority had to deal with some of the issues outlined within the report, and there needed to be expectation management with regards to these issues as many of them had to be dealt with by the police service.

Michael Firmager (Deputy Executive Member for Environment and Leisure) and Nicholas Austin (Interim Assistant Director – Customer and Localities) attended the meeting to answer Member queries.

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

- How effective were dispersal orders? Officer response – A number of these orders had been made during lockdown. The main goal was to engage with repeat underage offenders in order that positive changes could be made.
- There had been a large increase in the amount of bonfires throughout lockdown, which had generated a number of complaints. Were there any additional powers available to WBC to help enforce this? Officer response – Should black smoke be present at a bonfire, then an environmental notice could be served should the appropriate officer attend the scene. A communications release did ask residents to be considerate with their usage of bonfires throughout lockdown, however in the absence of black smoke or continual bonfires then only advisory communications could be made, and there was not a blanket solution. With regards to commercial bonfires, these could often release toxic fumes into the environment. WBC were in the process of being very strict with commercial sites using bonfires to get rid of their waste, and fines of up to £5,000 could be issued on the second offence.
- What could be done to assist with the increasing numbers of domestic abuse victims? Officer response – A home refuge service was available which allowed for individuals to get away from their abusers, and WBC worked closely with Berkshire Women's Aid to reach out to victims. The key was about getting individuals to feel confident about referring themselves and getting the appropriate support.
- Were antisocial behaviour problems being dealt with effectively? Officer response – There were a number of particular 'trouble' areas within the Borough, which therefore had more support to deal with any issues. Antisocial behaviour was an acute problem which was difficult to deal with due to the sporadic nature of the incidents.
- It was noted that the management of play areas was handled very well throughout the closure and reopening phases, and thanks went out to the police and WBC officers for their support.
- Was the illegal encampment that settled within the Borough during lockdown dealt with? Officer response – Yes, the encampment was moved on and clean-up costs were issued to those responsible.
- It was noted that a good effort had been made to reduce incidences of fly tipping within the Borough. Officer comment – Members and residents should report phone numbers seen on flyers for suspicious waste removal services to help fill in the information gap.
- It was noted that the 'Prevent' training leaflet associated with the 'Channel Panel' would be circulated outside of the meeting.

- It was requested that WBC had both a Member and officer presence on the Wokingham Independent Advisory Group forum.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) Michael Firmager and Nicholas Austin be thanked for attending the Committee;
- 2) The 'Prevent' training leaflet associated with the 'Channel Panel' be circulated outside of the meeting;
- 3) Officers investigate options so that WBC had both a Member and officer presence on the Wokingham Independent Advisory Group forum;
- 4) The report, questions, and responses be used within the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee's overall report on WBC's initial response to the C-19 pandemic.

36. COVID 19 - COMMUNITY RESPONSE

The Committee considered a report, set out in agenda pages 41 to 66, which outlined Wokingham Borough Council's (WBC's) initial response with regards to the community response to the Covid-19 (C-19) pandemic.

The report outlined that the ambition was to support vital community services and deliver public health advice for a consistent response. Communications were critical in enabling an effective response throughout the lockdown, whilst supporting the Borough's vulnerable residents. WBC proactively phone called the most vulnerable residents within the Borough as a welfare check, to make sure they had access to vital services and resources.

WBC ran the community hub to provide access to food for residents that were in need. Personal protective equipment (PPE) was also provided to the voluntary sector as and when required. A mobility programme was undertaken in order to allow shielded residents to regain any lost mobility as a result of lockdown shielding. All aspects of the community response were regularly reviewed and adjusted.

Regarding the Wokingham Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB), it was stated that a large part of the response was down to assistance from WBC officers, and the CAB was very thankful to Martin Sloan and a range of other WBC officers for their support. The 'one front door' system helped over 3200 clients' access a range of services and support. The CAB had received a 180% increase in employment related inquiries throughout the lockdown period. Calls were received for help with food and prescriptions, and other needs such as housing were identified during these calls. Feedback on the support offered via the CAB was received and monitored throughout lockdown.

Martin Sloan (Head of Service – Community Care Services) and Jake Morrison (Chief Executive – Wokingham CAB) attended the meeting to answer Member queries.

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

- It was noted that the overall community response had been fantastic, and a job well done. The 'one front door' system worked very well as it allowed residents needs to be

picked up in a central place. Members were keen to make sure that the CAB was properly funded to allow for the same level of service to be delivered going forwards.

- How long would it take to set up the food hub again if required? Officer response – The plan was that the food hub would not be required to be set up again, as there were now better avenues to distribute food to those in need. If a food hub was required, the Borough leisure centres would need to be closed and volunteers would need to be sought. If necessary, the hub could be opened within days, however it was likely that other avenues would provide better options.
- Would WBC be reimbursed for PPE given out to voluntary organisations? Officer response – The Government has told Local Authorities to provide PPE to suitable organisations for the time being, and hopefully grant funding would be forthcoming.
- It was noted that the national food parcel scheme was not particularly effective, and this would be better delivered on a local level. WBC was prepared to deliver this within the Borough if required.
- Was the voluntary sector mental health contact funded by WBC? Officer response – Mental health issues were identified and signposted and approved via the integration board through the ring-fenced better care fund. This filled the gap in the service that WBC offered, and allowed for other parts of the voluntary sector to receive the appropriate training.
- It was noted by Jake Morrison that the CAB wanted to see if the ‘one front door’ system could offer additional help, by tracing whether wellbeing of service users was better after 3 to 4 weeks from the first point of contact. This would allow the CAB to view the bigger picture and thereby achieve better outcomes for clients. There were studies which showed plenty of links between other issues and mental health, and this was therefore a priority.
- It was noted that WBC had been ahead of the curve in several areas, including requiring those entering care homes from hospital to have had a negative C-19 test, and providing PPE to those organisations in need before the Government made this a policy. In addition, WBC managed to find housing for all those homeless individuals who wished to have housing provided. WBC would continue to bid for additional funding to cover services where available.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) Martin Sloan and Jake Morrison be thanked for attending the meeting;
- 2) The report, questions, and responses be used within the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee’s overall report on WBC’s initial response to the C-19 pandemic.

37. SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS RELATED TO THE COMMITTEE'S REVIEW OF THE INITIAL COVID-19 RESPONSE

The Committee discussed the range of items they had considered related to the Covid-19 (C-19) pandemic. After deliberation, it was agreed that officers and the Chairman use the agenda reports, questions and minutes to feed into the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee’s overall report on WBC’s initial response to the C-19 pandemic.

RESOLVED That that officers and the Chairman use the agenda reports, questions and minutes to feed into the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee's overall report on WBC's initial response to the C-19 pandemic.

**MINUTES OF A VIRTUAL MEETING OF THE
COMMUNITY AND CORPORATE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
HELD ON 13 OCTOBER 2020 FROM 7.00 PM TO 9.06 PM**

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Guy Grandison (Chairman), Shirley Boyt, Clive Jones, Abdul Loyes and Alison Swaddle

Officers Present

Callum Wernham (Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist) and Graham Ebers (Deputy Chief Executive)

Executive Members Present

John Kaiser (Executive Member for Finance and Housing)

38. APOLOGIES

An apology for absence was submitted from Paul Fishwick, Emma Hobbs, and Graham Howe.

Caroline Smith attended the meeting as a substitute for Paul Fishwick.

Chris Bowring attended the meeting as a substitute for Graham Howe.

Pauline Helliar-Symons attended the meeting as a substitute for Emma Hobbs.

39. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

40. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

Guy Grandison proposed that Emma Hobbs be appointed as Vice Chairman for the remainder of the municipal year. This was seconded by Alison Swaddle.

RESOLVED That Emma Hobbs be appointed as Vice Chairman for the remainder of the municipal year.

41. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no public questions.

42. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

There were no Member questions.

43. MTFP 2021-24: STRATEGIC OVERVIEW

The Committee received a report, set out in agenda pages 5 to 16, which gave a strategic overview of the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) for 2021-24.

John Kaiser (Executive Member for Finance and Housing) and Graham Ebers (Deputy Chief Executive) attended the meeting to answer Member queries.

Graham Ebers stated that Wokingham Borough Council (WBC) remained the lowest funded Unitary Authority per head of population. The revenue support grant received by WBC not totalled £0, and as Council Tax was now considered a resource WBC was now seen as a highly resourced Local Authority. Graham stated that WBC needed to continue

to make representations to MPs and the Government to ensure that WBC was adequately funded to cover the costs of statutory service delivery.

Graham stated that the impact of Covid-19 (C-19) would not fit neatly into one financial year, and therefore the cost implications needed to be looked at on a more medium term level. The expectation was that the adult social care precept would be allowed once more due to the financial pressures related to this service as a result of C-19. The Children's Services department was still in the process of achieving a "Good" OFSTED rating, with expenditure being detailed within the MTFP, and detailed bids would be received by the Committee in the coming weeks and months. The 21st Century reorganisation had saved £3m per annum in efficiency savings and staffing reductions. Graham stated that the government's consultation proposals regarding housing numbers would, if approved, place significant budgetary pressure on WBC in addition to increasing demand on all of our services. Graham added that the MTFP was a work in progress plan, and urged all Members to make representations to MPs and the Government for a fair 4 year Local Government finance settlement.

John Kaiser stated that last year was the first year where the draft MTFP had received detailed consideration by the Community and Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee. John added that a similar approach would be taken this year, and he hoped for productive and positive discussions to take place. Much work had already been undertaken in order to achieve a balanced budget, and a portion of the 2021/22 budget would be funded by WBC's reserves in addition to the awaited Local Government finance settlement for the upcoming year. John stated that although WBC's reserves were at a safe level, there were many unknowns that needed to be considered this year as these were unprecedented times.

Graham Ebers stated that Resources and Assets were due to make large savings in 2020/21, which would allow for the budget submissions from that year be an overall net saving compared to the previous year. WBC had now engaged in a commercialisation programme, which looked at a variety of areas such as early intervention, prevention, and demand management. WBC's asset stock would be evaluated, and further options to utilise technology within business operations would be investigated. Graham stated that the current prediction of £1.689 million budget variance would look to be addressed via efficiency savings, with the fall back of using reserves in the worst case. WBC would have exceeded the balancing of the budget by approximately £2m for 2020/21, however there was a carryover of £3.5m from the previous financial year. Graham was of the opinion that WBC were in a positive position in the medium term, however this had to be viewed in the context of a series of unknown factors.

Graham Ebers stated that every 1% of Council tax that was not collected amounted to an approximate loss of £1.17m to WBC, and a 99% collection rate had been assumed within the MTFP. Similarly, a 99% collection rate had been assumed for the collection of business rates, and every 1% of business rates that were not collected amounted to an approximate loss of £0.526m to WBC. With the Government furlough scheme coming to an end, WBC needed to be mindful of the potential additional demand on our services and resources, in addition to a possible loss in the income collection rate. With the Local Government finance settlement unknown, and items such as the public health grant, new homes bonus, community infrastructure levy (CIL) and Section 106 (S106) facing an uncertain future, the MTFP needed to be viewed within the context of this uncertain future.

John Kaiser stated that all rough sleepers who wished to accept WBC's offer to find them accommodation had been taken off of the street, and there was a strong desire to maintain this. Members and officers recognised the costs and pressures placed on individuals and families within the Borough, and WBC did not want to add to the woes of these individual and families. John added that it fell on all Members and officers to allow rough sleepers to continue to have access to suitable accommodation.

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

- Were the projected £200k savings as a result of commercialisation net savings after the cost of employing the staff involved in the project? Officer response – Yes, the £200k savings were a net saving. The persons working on this project were from the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA), who had a considerable knowledge base and worked with a wide range of Local Authorities.
- Was the Council Tax collection rate prediction to optimistic? Executive Member and officer response – WBC was currently achieving a 98.5% collection rate. Letters had been sent out to approximately 2000 residents, 1000 of which had now agreed a restructure. Of the other 1000 residents, further correspondence would be sent to try and agree a restructure. Including where a restructure had been agreed, WBC was currently 0.2% above our collection rate target. The Government had extended the period for Local Authorities to address their collection rate figures to 3 years. In addition, the MTFP assumed a modest 1% increase in the Council Tax base, which would be higher in all likelihood.
- What was the Council Tax base increase in the previous year? Officer response – This would be checked and an answer provided to the Committee.
- How much was C-19 costing each directorate specifically? Officer response – This was set out within the revenue monitoring report that is received periodically by the Executive Committee, with the next report due in October. There would be quite a number of special items within the MTFP as these would help address short term issues with one off funding.
- What was seen as an adequate level of reserves, and how was this defined? Officer response – There was no exact science to a safe level of reserves, but in general an adequate level of reserves would cover all medium and high risks, and this was deemed to be around the £10m level for WBC. The figure of £10m was at the more prudent end of the scale, and anywhere significantly below £7m would become a concern. The general fund balance was predicted to be at around the £7m level at the end of the financial year, and this budget sought to restore that to some degree.
- Were there any costs associated with the new income streams, both proposed and implemented? Officer response – If capital costs were involved, these costs would form part of the capital programme. The return from the scheme must recover the capital costs and exceed this value to appear as an income stream and therefore a saving line within the MTFP.
- What would the financial effect be should the CIL and S106 calculations be changed? Executive Member response – If changes were made to CIL or S106, appropriate infrastructure would still need to be delivered to accommodate any new dwellings. It could be a possibility that it was the responsibility of the developer to provide the

infrastructure in future, however it would preferably continue to be delivered by Local Authorities as it gave us more control.

- What were the areas of growth within Children's Services, and how was any overspend within this service taken into account? Officer response – The detailed bids would be provided at a future Committee meeting, however in general a large part of the growth was needed to continue the journey to a "Good" OFSTED rating. There was not a significant level of overspend within Children's Services this year, and any overspend was valuable information for future years' budget setting.
- Were the suggested saving from the Council Tax reduction scheme ambitious considering the current economic circumstances? Executive Member and officer response – The suggested savings were based on current data, and this was subject to change. There was no intention to reduce access to this scheme for those who needed it, and the proposals were currently out for consultation and a more positive announcement was hopefully forthcoming. There was no expectation for the costs of C-19 to fall upon those who could least afford it within the Borough.
- What was an average amount of money received through CIL and S106 in an average year? Executive Member and officer response – This figure differed between financial years, as it was linked to housing numbers and specific projects. On a very rough estimate, approximately £100m-£120m could be received over a 3 year period.
- Was there any prediction as to the 4 year Local Government finance settlement value? Officer response – Officers were presuming a replication of the last one year financial settlement for the next financial year. Beyond this, it was almost impossible to assume a longer term funding figure, and it was more important than ever for WBC to continue to make representations to MPs and the Government to ensure that ongoing funding covered the basic costs associated with running a Unitary Authority.
- What was the view on Local Authorities commercially investing, and did this bring about value to WBC? Executive Member response – There had been a lot of bad press surrounding this issue due to a number of Local Authorities who were aggressively pursuing this as a funding strategy. WBC had a very prudent approach to this strategy, which amounted to approximately 8% of the investment compared to the most involved Local Authorities investment patterns. WBC were investing to resource and deliver local affordable homes, whilst receiving a modest investment to help resource other Council services.
- Had there been any change regarding the discussions around a negative revenue support grant for WBC? Officer response – WBC had won this argument thanks to strong representations to MPs and the Government. However there was a concern that the effects of a policy such as this could be seen within the future 4 year settlement, and therefore strong representations needed to continue.
- Should a negative revenue support grant be implemented, would almost all Services be funded via Council Tax? Officer response – Should WBC had lost the negative revenue support grant argument, we would have headed towards a 100% Council Tax funding programme. Having won that argument, approximately 85% of Council Services were funded by Council Tax.

- What were the predicted reserve levels in 2021/22? Officer response – This was expected to be in the region of £10m, however as previously stated this was subject to change due to unprecedented times.
- Any reductions of the reserve fund would trend it towards potentially concerning levels, and it was therefore crucial that the Committee assessed the deliverability of proposals and the impacts of any savings. Executive Member response – WBC must act responsibly, as we have a duty of care to our residents via delivery of statutory services. The intention at the moment was to end this financial year with a reserve balance of approximately £7m, and then increase this value to £10m in the following financial year.
- Children’s Services had been overspent in recent years. Were WBC more confident of less overspend in this area in the upcoming financial year? Executive Member response – Children’s Services were on the journey to achieve a “Good” OFSTED rating, and it was now felt that the Service was in a position to recognise the costs of Service delivery with less reliance on supplementary budgets.
- Was there anything that the officers and Executive Members wanted from the Committee specifically, in order to help scrutinise the MTFP proposals? Executive Member and officer response – For context, a £13m funding gap was present at the start of this year’s budget formulation, however via the Corporate Leadership Team and Member engagement this figure now sat at £1.7m, which was significantly better than the situation faced by some Local Authorities. In essence, it was incredible that officers and Members had reached this point. It was hoped that the Committee would continue to engage in respectful questioning and Scrutiny, in order to identify productive areas of exploration.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) John Kaiser and Graham Ebers be thanked for attending the Committee;
- 2) Detailed bids related to each Service Directorate be provided to the Committee at future meetings;
- 3) Executive Members and Officers be invited to attend the appropriate Committee meetings to assist the Committee with their review of each Service area’s growth and savings proposals;
- 4) The Council Tax base increase figure for the previous year be provided to the Committee.

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF A VIRTUAL MEETING OF THE
COMMUNITY AND CORPORATE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
HELD ON 28 OCTOBER 2020 FROM 7.00 PM TO 9.03 PM**

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Guy Grandison (Chairman), Emma Hobbs (Vice-Chairman), Shirley Boyt, Paul Fishwick, Graham Howe, Clive Jones, Abdul Loyes and Alison Swaddle

Other Councillors Present

Councillors: Caroline Smith

Officers Present

Graham Ebers (Deputy Chief Executive (Director of Resources and Assets)), Matt Pope (Director of Adult Social Care and Health), Chris Traill (Director of Place and Growth) and Callum Wernham (Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist)

Executive Members Present

John Kaiser (Executive Member for Finance and Housing), Parry Batth (Executive Member for Environment and Leisure), Pauline Jorgensen (Executive Member for Highways and Transport), and Charles Margetts (Executive Member for Health, Wellbeing and Adult Services)

44. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence.

45. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

A declaration of interest was submitted from Emma Hobbs regarding agenda item number 48, on the grounds that she was a Trustee for the Wokingham Advice Bureau. Emma stated that she would continue to take part in the discussion and questioning for this item.

46. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no public questions.

47. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

There were no Member questions.

48. MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN 2021-24: REVENUE BUDGET

The Committee considered a report, set out in agenda pages 5 to 102, which outlined the proposed revenue bids for Adult's Services and Place & Growth.

John Kaiser (Executive Member for Finance and Housing), Parry Batth (Executive Member for Environment and Leisure), Pauline Jorgensen (Executive Member for Highways and Transport), Charles Margetts (Executive Member for Health, Wellbeing and Adult Services), Graham Ebers (Deputy Chief Executive (Director of Resources and Assets), Matt Pope (Director of Adult Services), and Chris Traill (Director of Place & Growth) attended the meeting to answer Member queries.

John Kaiser stated that the Council was in the middle of its pandemic response, and any proposals were subject to change as a result of the pandemic response. John added that the papers also included special items, which had not been agreed and were subject to review.

Graham Ebers stated that the papers presented showed all of the proposed savings and growth bids of £50k or over for Adult Services and Place & Growth. Graham added that special items and capital bids for these directorates would be presented at a future meeting.

Matt Pope stated that the Adult's Services budget was approximately £62m, with a net income of approximately £52m. Matt added that in general, when people were approaching the service for help they tended to be in greater need and from an aging demographic. Part of the Adult's Services transformation plan had included a review into the Optalis contract price, resulting in an overall reduction in costs. In addition, demand management had become a large part of the service, whereby staff worked closely together and with management to deliver a good service whilst looking after staff. Charles Margetts added that the service was experiencing uncertain times as a result of the Covid-19 (C-19) pandemic, and as such all bids were subject to change.

During the ensuing discussions relating to Adult's Services, Members raised the following points and queries:

- Relating to bid 6, better use of accommodation relating to learning disability review, could this be clarified? Officer response – Residential services for people with a learning disability tended to be quite expensive. In addition, this was quite an old mode of service delivery specifically for people with a learning disability. Most people with a learning disability need, requiring support, now accessed supported living where Wokingham Borough Council (WBC) paid for the care and support, but the individual got access to housing via streams such as housing benefits. Therefore, this was about moving away from the old style towards the newer supported living style, slightly reducing the overall costs and giving people a more independent life.
- Could clarification be given regarding the £62m gross expenses and the £52m net income? Officer response – Some of the income was made up of grants, however most of this was made up of charges for adult social care. Officers looked at the average costs, and then made a projection for the likely costs for the next year whilst taking into account the numbers of people moving in and out of the Borough and the needs of our residents. This calculation was placed into a spreadsheet formula to produce a projection.
- Had C-19 and the effect on the voluntary sector been factored in to the bid proposals? Officer response – Yes, WBC had a close and positive working relationship with the voluntary sector, in addition to a new voluntary sector strategy. There was a good deal of infrastructure around the voluntary sector, and there had been additional funding placed to pay for staff to write bids. More money would be placed into the voluntary sector year on year, to invest in this area to allow people to be more independent for a longer time, therefore reducing overall demand on the service.
- How would the £1m one-off investment into demand management help to produce a year on year saving? Officer response – The one-off payment in each of the years would pay for additional staffing and resourcing to get the service through that change, with a payback time of approximately two years. In the long term, a saving of £1m per year would be realised against demand.
- Were the savings proposals relating to Optalis realised from the 2020-23 MTFP proposals? Officer response – Yes, the savings had been realised, and the forecasted

savings within the draft 2021-24 MTFP were projected to be realised. Part of the saving came from winning the argument regarding the splitting of central management costs with the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.

- What were the new ways of working related to demand management? Officer response – This was multifaceted, and included strength based working such as investing in arming staff with the appropriate skillsets to enable earlier and better conversations with service users in order to save WBC money in the long term. Pilots in this area were being formed to gear up for the year ahead.
- What lessons had been learnt from the response to date to the C-19 pandemic? Officer response – Transformations within the service had already been made within the service as a result of the C-19 response. In addition, WBC had formed stronger relationships with the voluntary sector, to enable people to get help from the voluntary sector prior to waiting for a crisis to occur which would require formal adult social care intervention.
- Had the saving of £250k relating to the review of the application of continued health care been realised from the 2020-23 MTFP proposals? Officer response – Yes the savings had been realised, and the savings proposals for this year were a continuation of this. The savings last year were the easier savings to make, hence the lower projected savings level for the next financial year.
- Had the saving of £100k relating to commissioning savings been realised from the 2020-23 MTFP proposals? Officer response – Yes this had been realised, however C-19 had caused some differences, though overall the savings had been delivered.
- How much had been spent on Adult Social Care in 2019/20? Officer response – These figures would be provided at a later date, as various departments had moved slightly and been renamed in the interim.
- The Committee were very pleased with the negotiations regarding contract management of Optalis, and gave praise to all those involved.
- Had the saving of £250k relating to existing care packages been realised from the 2020-23 MTFP proposals? Officer response – Yes these savings had been realised via efficiency of delivery of existing care provision.
- There had been an expected saving of £400k related to social care grants, had this been realised? Officer response – Yes these savings had been realised and would be a recurring saving year on year.
- Had the saving of £300k relating to the adult social care pathway redesign been realised from the 2020-23 MTFP proposals? Officer response – Yes these savings had been made via efficiency savings, including through the voluntary sector and the “one front door” approach.

The Committee moved on to their overview of the savings and growth proposals for the Place & Growth directorate.

Pauline Jorgensen stated that there had been increases in the Volker Highways contract, which had resulted in increased quality of service delivery. The current incumbents of the contract were not willing to bid on the lower end.

Parry Bath stated that income had been received from the previous contractor of the Toutley depot, as they had paid WBC for use of the facilities. Parry added that the other growth bid under his area of responsibility was the procurement of the waterproof recycling bags. On to savings, Parry stated that there was a proposed £5 increase to the charge for brown garden waste recycling bins. In addition, a saving would be realised from additional recycling as a result of the introduction of the waterproof recycling bags. Parry stated that a saving would be made as a result of increased uptake of garden waste bins. Finally, a 10% increase to parking fees and fishing permits at country parks was proposed.

During the ensuing discussions relating to Place and Growth, Members raised the following points and queries:

- How long had the brown garden waste bins been priced at £60? Executive Member response – The brown garden waste recycling bins had been priced at £60 for approximately 8 years, and the proposal was for the price to increase to a £65 per year charge. This increase had been benchmarked against a number of other Local Authorities.
- How confident were officers that the suggested increase in recycling levels would materialise? Officer response – Part of WBC's ongoing strategy was to increase the overall capacity for recycling within the Borough, in line with the overall waste management strategy. The increases, as projected, were in line with this strategy.
- Would the Wokingham Business Association Retailers be included within the review of parking charges? Executive Member response – Any increases would be consulted on widely, balancing the income need for the Council against making sure that damage was not done to businesses. These proposals would affect all towns within the Borough, and it was therefore important to be fair and equitable across the Borough when consulting.
- Some other Local Authorities offered a discount on garden waste bins for those eligible for the Council Tax reduction scheme, were WBC looking into this as a possibility? Executive Member and officer response – It was really important to get residents into the habit of recycling. A possible option would be to allow residents to pay for their garden waste bin in monthly instalments, rather than a one off fee, in order to make the payment more manageable. In addition, neighbours were welcome to share a bin and split the payment between themselves.
- Why was there not a projection for cost increases from the garden waste contractor over the three year period, given the projection of increased garden waste recycling? Officer response – There had been a lot of good will from the contractor, who believed they were able to absorb some of those costs. It was important to bear in mind that this was subject to change, as the state of the industry was ever changing. The £5 increase could always be reviewed should economic circumstances change.
- The revenue drainage budget for 19/20 was covered by underspends from other parts of the directorate's budget. How was the 20/21 revenue drainage budget coping with no increase within this financial year? Executive Member response – Going forward,

efficiency savings within the service would be explored. For the current financial year, these costs had been manageable within the existing directorate's budget.

- With new road networks on the horizon, how would the related budgets cope with the total Borough road network? Executive Member response – These increases would be covered via efficiency savings within the directorate. New roads generally had little associated maintenance costs, as the infrastructure was new and built to a high standard. In addition, new roads were under warranty for a period of time. It was not expected for the costs to increase significantly for some time.
- There was a proposed £210k growth bid relating to the contractor costs for highways cleansing and maintenance, was this a sufficient amount when compared to neighbouring Local Authorities? Executive Member response – A balance needed to be struck between delivering a quality service for residents, whilst keeping costs as low as possible. There was a tendency to spend all available budget regardless of the size of the budget, and therefore this growth amount would be monitored over time to assess whether any additional funding was required.
- Was the £600k proposed growth bid related to highways reactive maintenance sufficient? Executive Member and officer response – Yes, this amount was projected to enable the service to deliver the reactive highways maintenance programme across the Borough, taking into account increases in demand.
- There was a lost income of £320k related to the Toutley depot due to a change in contractors. Why was this not taken into account when letting the contract, thereby showing up in the three year MTFP? Executive Member and officer response – Historically, the previous contractors paid WBC £320k per annum for use of the facilities. Should this charge have been levied against the new contractors, they would have increased the overall contract cost. This would have been negotiated previously, and absorbed into last year's budgeting. The figures presented showed the bottom line figures. The previous incumbent of the contract did not bid on the new contract, and they were no longer affordable.
- How long were the new Toutley road contracts in place for? Executive Member and officer response – There was a cluster of partners working out of the Toutley depot, with an approximate contract length of seven years.
- When would additional waterproof recycling be required for purchase? Officer response – The longevity of the bags had been factored into the costing, and there was a sufficient amount for the roll-out for this year and the beginning of next year. With the increased, income, this service should be managed within the existing budget portfolio. The bags were predicted to last for five years, with contingency planning built into the business case.
- How many brown garden waste recycling bins were in operation across the Borough? Executive Member response – This figure would be provided at a later date.
- Was there an existing price increase to the country park car parking charges? Executive Member and officer response – The se of Dinton had been very popular, and there was a large appeal to a ready market. The income figure would be kept under review, and it was built into the existing business plan for Dinton Pastures. The

charges were designed to be cost neutral, and any additional monies would be invested back into the country parks.

- How was car parking charges in non-country park areas of the Borough being assessed? Executive Member and officer response – The charges were being reassessed to check that they were in line with similar areas, whilst ensuring that they were available for use by residents. Regarding the risks related to C-19 and town centre usage, this was being balanced against a one-off special item, with more confidence for the following year.
- Did Thames Water charge WBC for damage to their network from tree roots? Executive Member response – No, this was absorbed by Thames Water as a part of their maintenance programme.
- Had the brown garden waste recycling bags been assessed for an increase? Executive Member response – These were used by some residents who required infrequent usage, and were charged at £1. The cost had not been increased as it was deemed as not worthwhile.
- Regarding the Government's White Paper on planning reform, was there potential for less planning applications due to permitted development rights, and therefore the additional income from pre-application's may not be realised? Executive Member response – The proposals were based on the current system and the rules and regulations that are being worked within currently. Contingency plans were in place should things change, however the current savings lines related to this were a reasonable estimate.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) John Kaiser, Parry Batth, Pauline Jorgensen, Charles Margetts, Graham Ebers, Matt Pope, and Chris Traill be thanked for attending the meeting;
- 2) The total spend within Adult's Services for 2019/20 be provided to the Committee;
- 3) The total amount of brown garden waste recycling bins in use across the Borough be provided to the Committee;
- 4) Special items, updated revenue bids, and capital bids for Adult's Services and Place & Growth be considered by the Committee at a later date.

TITLE	Medium Term Financial Plan 2021-24: Revenue Budget
FOR CONSIDERATION BY	Community and Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 23 November 2020
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 presented with the growth and savings bids for the Children's Services (CS), Community Insight and Change (CIC) and the Resources and Assets (R&A) directorates. Details are only provided for individual growth and savings bids of £50,000 or more.

SUMMARY OF REPORT

The September O&S budget meeting was briefed by the Deputy Chief Executive on the summary revenue budget position, including the timetable and approach, and the meeting in October considered the bids from the Adult Social Care directorate and the Place and Growth directorate. Detailed bid templates for growth and savings items of £50,000 or more are now provided for scrutiny for the remaining services of the Council: Children's Services (CS); Community Insight and Change (CIC) and the Resources and Assets (R&A) directorates.

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 2020.

Analysis of Issues

The appended business cases inform all revenue and growth bids over £50,000.

Please note the figures for Years 2 and 3 in CIC bid number 33 (Libraries) are erroneous and subject to further review; they are shown here in order to reconcile back to the report presented in September. All reports will be updated to reflect any changes and brought back to this committee on 21 January 2021 prior to presentation to Council in February 2021.

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 2021, 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.

Reasons for considering the report in Part 2

N/A

List of Background Papers

MTFP 2020-23

Contact Graham Ebers	Service Resources and Assets
Telephone No 6557	Email graham.ebers@wokingham.gov.uk

Revenue Budget Setting 2020/21 to 2022/23

Directorate: Children's Services

Cumulative movement from 20/21*

Bid No.	Type	Bid Name	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	RAG Status
CS.1	Growth	Placements	£650,000	£1,075,000	£1,415,000	Amber
CS.2	Growth	Legal Costs - Social Care	£400,000	£400,000	£400,000	Amber
CS.3	Growth	Emergency Duty Service	£65,000	£65,000	£65,000	Green
CS.5	Growth	Home to School Transport	£400,000	£700,000	£850,000	Red
CS.8	Growth	Legal Costs - SEND	£100,000	£100,000	£100,000	Amber
CS.16	Savings	Home to School Transport	(£150,000)	(£250,000)	(£750,000)	Red
CS.15	Savings	Placements Review	(£530,000)	(£780,000)	(£1,280,000)	Amber
CS.17	Savings	Reconfiguration of Children's Services	(£400,000)	(£650,000)	(£2,000,000)	Amber
CS.18	Savings	Legal Review - Social Care & SEND	(£125,000)	(£150,000)	(£150,000)	Amber
		Total	£410,000	£510,000	(£1,350,000)	

£1,615,000	£2,340,000	£2,830,000
£0	£0	£0
(£1,205,000)	(£1,830,000)	(£4,180,000)
£0	£0	£0

* Special Items - Non Cumulative

Revenue Budget Setting 2021/22 to 2023/24

Directorate	Children's Services
--------------------	---------------------

Bid Details

Bid Type	Growth	Permanent increase in expenditure or reduction in income budget
-----------------	--------	---

Bid Name	Placements
Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	The cost of placements for Children in Care is rising, partially due to a rise in demand and weekly rates, and partially due to a number of children and young people coming into our care with complex needs requiring high-cost support. Our number of children in care in Wokingham is relatively low compared to national and regional comparators. This means, however, that just one child coming into our care with complex needs, which is unanticipated, can have a large impact on overall costs (see evidence below), and the inability to predict such occurrences can make our budget needs somewhat difficult to forecast. This growth bid reflects an estimated 2% increase in numbers for year 1, rising to 4% in years 2 & 3, plus the known cost burden over the next three years of three complex cases who entered our care this year.

Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref	<p style="text-align: center;">New Placements 20/21: Weekly Rates</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Weekly Rate: New Placements 20/21</p>
---	---

Impact if bid not successful	These are unavoidable costs for children and young people in receipt of statutory support to secure their safety and wellbeing.
-------------------------------------	---

Additional comments	
----------------------------	--

Finance Information

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
		2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	£650,000	£425,000	£340,000
	Income	£0	£0	£0
Cumulative movement from 20/21 budget		£650,000	£1,075,000	£1,415,000

RAG Status (Certainty around financial request and project delivery)	Green	High certainty on figures and project delivery
	Amber	Some certainty on figures and project delivery
	Red	Low certainty on figures and project delivery

Select "RAG Status"	Amber
---------------------	-------

Comments regarding RAG Status	The RAG status demonstrates the uncertainty around demand and complexity of cases.
--------------------------------------	--

Benchmarking

Supporting benchmarking information (Unit cost, demand stats, comparison to LAs, etc)	
--	--

Sign Off

Service Manager	Jasmine Grimshaw
Assistant Director	Adam Davis
Director	Carol Cammiss, Director of Children's Services
Lead Member Briefed	Cllr Ullakarin Clark

Revenue Budget Setting 2021/22 to 2023/24

Directorate	Children's Services
--------------------	---------------------

Bid Details

Bid Type	Growth	Permanent increase in expenditure or reduction in income budget
-----------------	--------	---

Bid Name	Legal Costs - Social Care
Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	Some of our work to secure the safety and wellbeing of children and young people in Wokingham requires the intervention of courts and the support of legal professionals and there are costs associated with this. These costs have risen recently, partly as a result of market forces, and partially due to complex cases requiring expensive specialist legal advice. Financial modelling and forecasting of legal spend has concluded that these rises are unavoidable in the medium term, and need to be met through budget growth.

Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <thead> <tr style="background-color: #d9ead3;"> <th></th> <th>2018/19 Actual £,000</th> <th>2019/20 Actual £,000</th> <th>2020/21 Forecast £,000</th> <th>2020/21 Recurring Budget £,000</th> <th>2021/22 Growth Bid £,000</th> <th>2021/22 Draft Budget £,000</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Social Care</td> <td>498</td> <td>974</td> <td>830</td> <td>388</td> <td>400</td> <td>788</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SEND</td> <td>54</td> <td>126</td> <td>110</td> <td>0</td> <td>100</td> <td>100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		2018/19 Actual £,000	2019/20 Actual £,000	2020/21 Forecast £,000	2020/21 Recurring Budget £,000	2021/22 Growth Bid £,000	2021/22 Draft Budget £,000	Social Care	498	974	830	388	400	788	SEND	54	126	110	0	100	100
	2018/19 Actual £,000	2019/20 Actual £,000	2020/21 Forecast £,000	2020/21 Recurring Budget £,000	2021/22 Growth Bid £,000	2021/22 Draft Budget £,000																
Social Care	498	974	830	388	400	788																
SEND	54	126	110	0	100	100																

Impact if bid not successful	It is our statutory responsibility to safeguard children and young people, and these costs are unavoidable.
-------------------------------------	---

Additional comments	
----------------------------	--

Finance Information

		Yr 1 2021/22	Yr 2 2022/23	Yr 3 2023/24
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	£400,000	£0	£0
	Income	£0	£0	£0
<i>Cumulative movement from 20/21 budget</i>		£400,000	£400,000	£400,000

RAG Status (Certainty around financial request and project delivery)	Green	High certainty on figures and project delivery
	Amber	Some certainty on figures and project delivery
	Red	Low certainty on figures and project delivery

Select "RAG Status"	Amber
----------------------------	-------

Comments regarding RAG Status	The Amber RAG Rating reflects uncertainty over number and complexity of cases which may come into Children's Social Care, and which need legal input.
--------------------------------------	---

Benchmarking

Supporting benchmarking information (Unit cost, demand stats, comparison to LAs, etc)	
--	--

Sign Off

Service Manager	Estelle Kelleway
Assistant Director	Adam Davis
Director	Carol Cammiss, Director of Children's Services
Lead Member Briefed	Cllr Ullakarin Clark

Revenue Budget Setting 2021/22 to 2023/24

Directorate	Children's Services
--------------------	---------------------

Bid Details

Bid Type	Growth	Permanent increase in expenditure or reduction in income budget
Bid Name	Emergency Duty Service	
Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	The Emergency Duty Service provides out of hours social work support for Children's and Adults' Services. This a Joint arrangement with a number of local authorities, hosted by Bracknell Forest Council, and has recently been reviewed in the face of increasing demand across the system. While this has delivered some reduction in costs for the next contract period, the existing budget had not kept pace with cost increases in recent years. This growth bid will meet the additional cost of the new contract over the next three years, and avoid overspend.	
Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref		
Impact if bid not successful	The Emergency Duty Service provides statutory out of hours services and as such the cost cannot be avoided.	
Additional comments		

Finance Information

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
		2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	£65,000	£0	£0
	Income	£0	£0	£0
<i>Cumulative movement from 20/21 budget</i>		£65,000	£65,000	£65,000

RAG Status (Certainty around financial request and project delivery)	Green	High certainty on figures and project delivery
	Amber	Some certainty on figures and project delivery
	Red	Low certainty on figures and project delivery

Select "RAG Status"	Green
----------------------------	-------

Comments regarding RAG Status	
--------------------------------------	--

Benchmarking

Supporting benchmarking information (Unit cost, demand stats, comparison to LAs, etc)	
--	--

Sign Off

Service Manager	Estelle Kelleway
Assistant Director	Adam Davis
Director	Carol Cammiss, Director of Children's Services
Lead Member Briefed	Cllr Ullakarin Clark

Revenue Budget Setting 2021/22 to 2023/24

Directorate	Children's Services
--------------------	---------------------

Bid Details

Bid Type	Growth	Permanent increase in expenditure or reduction in income budget
-----------------	--------	---

Bid Name	Home to School Transport
Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	Home to School Transport is provided to children and young people who are eligible for this service due to the distance they live from their allocated school, or due to their particular special education and/or disability (SEND) need. The cost of this service is rising and the additional burden in 2020/21 has added to ongoing budget pressure. A review of our Home to School Transport provision is ongoing as part of the Council's Community Transport Programme, however a review of cost and demand analysis to date continues to indicate rising budget pressures.

Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref	Of £3.5m spent on Home to School Transport in 2019/20, over 80% was on SEND and mainstream Secondary arrangements
---	---

Area of spend	Amount (£)
SEN out of Borough contracts	1,264,366.10
SEN Wokingham Borough contracts	856,995.00
Mainstream Secondary contracts	753,886.25
SUBTOTAL	2,875,247.35

Impact if bid not successful	This is a statutory service, and the costs cannot be avoided.
-------------------------------------	---

Additional comments	
----------------------------	--

Finance Information

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
		2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	£400,000	£300,000	£150,000
	Income	£0	£0	£0
<i>Cumulative movement from 20/21 budget</i>		£400,000	£700,000	£850,000

RAG Status (Certainty around financial request and project delivery)	Green	High certainty on figures and project delivery
	Amber	Some certainty on figures and project delivery
	Red	Low certainty on figures and project delivery

Select "RAG Status"	Red
----------------------------	-----

Comments regarding RAG Status	A review of our Home to School Transport provision is ongoing, including development of a robust financial model that takes account of the large number of complex variables that impact on the cost of transport. This will include further interrogation of client and journey level data to inform financial planning assumptions.
--------------------------------------	---

Benchmarking

Supporting benchmarking information (Unit cost, demand stats, comparison to LAs, etc)	
--	--

Sign Off

Service Manager	-
Assistant Director	Sal Thirlway
Director	Carol Cammiss, Director of Children's Services
Lead Member Briefed	Cllr Ullakarin Clark

Revenue Budget Setting 2021/22 to 2023/24

Directorate	Children's Services
--------------------	---------------------

Bid Details

Bid Type	Growth	Permanent increase in expenditure or reduction in income budget
Bid Name	Legal Costs - SEND	
Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	It is important that the needs of children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) are assessed accurately and provision is proportionate to need. In some cases legal advice and services are required to resolve differing opinions over the type and level of support to be included in the child's plan. Previously these legal costs have been met through budget overspend. This bid is to avoid recurrent overspend in the future.	
Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref		
Impact if bid not successful	Engaging legal services is an integral and unavoidable part of ensuring statutory EHCPs are delivered which meet the needs of the child.	
Additional comments		

Finance Information

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
		2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	£100,000	£0	£0
	Income	£0	£0	£0
<i>Cumulative movement from 20/21 budget</i>		£100,000	£100,000	£100,000

RAG Status (Certainty around financial request and project delivery)	Green	High certainty on figures and project delivery
	Amber	Some certainty on figures and project delivery
	Red	Low certainty on figures and project delivery

Select "RAG Status" Amber

Comments regarding RAG Status	Further review activity is currently being undertaken to fully determine actual cost trends to inform growth expectation.
--------------------------------------	---

Benchmarking

Supporting benchmarking information (Unit cost, demand stats, comparison to LAs, etc)	
--	--

Sign Off

Service Manager	Sonia Aulak
Assistant Director	Sal Thirlway
Director	Carol Cammiss, Director of Children's Services
Lead Member Briefed	Cllr Ullakarin Clark

Revenue Budget Setting 2021/22 to 2023/24

Directorate	Children's Services
--------------------	---------------------

Bid Details

Bid Type	Savings	Permanent reduction in expenditure or increase in income budget
Bid Name	Home to School Transport	
Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	Home to School Transport is currently subject to review to find efficiencies in provision of this statutory service for children and young people. Indicative savings as a result of this review are currently estimated as outlined here, although the review is still to be completed at the time of writing.	
Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref		
Impact if bid not successful		
Preparedness for implementation of savings		

Finance Information

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
		2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	(£150,000)	(£100,000)	(£500,000)
	Income	£0	£0	£0
<i>Cumulative movement from 20/21 budget</i>		(£150,000)	(£250,000)	(£750,000)

RAG Status (Certainty around financial request and project delivery)	Green	High certainty on figures and project delivery
	Amber	Some certainty on figures and project delivery
	Red	Low certainty on figures and project delivery

Select "RAG Status" Red

Comments regarding RAG Status	Current review work is identifying that there may be some delay in delivery of the proposed savings. This is due to statutory consultation requirements affecting the project delivery timeline.
--------------------------------------	--

Benchmarking

Supporting benchmarking information (Unit cost, demand stats, comparison to LAs, etc)	
--	--

Sign Off

Service Manager	-
Assistant Director	Sal Thirlway
Director	Carol Cammiss, Director of Children's Services
Lead Member Briefed	Cllr Ullakarin Clark

Revenue Budget Setting 2021/22 to 2023/24

Directorate	Children's Services
--------------------	---------------------

Bid Details

Bid Type	Savings	Permanent reduction in expenditure or increase in income budget
Bid Name	Placements Review	
Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	The placement strategy for children in care is currently under review. This, alongside the introduction of the Compass Team which is focussing on keeping children and young people out of the care system through provision of intensive wrap-round support, is currently estimating indicative savings on placements detailed in this bid.	
Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref		
Impact if bid not successful		
Preparedness for implementation of savings		

Finance Information

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
		2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	(£530,000)	(£250,000)	(£500,000)
	Income	£0	£0	£0
<i>Cumulative movement from 20/21 budget</i>		(£530,000)	(£780,000)	(£1,280,000)

RAG Status (Certainty around financial request and project delivery)	Green	High certainty on figures and project delivery
	Amber	Some certainty on figures and project delivery
	Red	Low certainty on figures and project delivery

Select "RAG Status" Amber

Comments regarding RAG Status	
--------------------------------------	--

Benchmarking

Supporting benchmarking information (Unit cost, demand stats, comparison to LAs, etc)	
--	--

Sign Off

Service Manager	Jasmine Grimshaw
Assistant Director	Adam Davis
Director	Carol Cammiss, Director of Children's Services
Lead Member Briefed	Cllr Ullakarin Clark

Revenue Budget Setting 2021/22 to 2023/24

Directorate	Children's Services
--------------------	---------------------

Bid Details

Bid Type	Savings	Permanent reduction in expenditure or increase in income budget
Bid Name	Reconfiguration of Children's Services	
Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	In order to deliver a balanced budget, a re-framing of how Children's Services are delivered is needed. Alternative ways of delivering support are currently being considered to address the need for savings whilst minimising the risk to delivery of positive outcomes for vulnerable children, young people and families.	
Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref		
Impact if bid not successful		
Preparedness for implementation of savings		

Finance Information

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
		2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	(£400,000)	(£250,000)	(£1,350,000)
	Income	£0	£0	£0
<i>Cumulative movement from 20/21 budget</i>		(£400,000)	(£650,000)	(£2,000,000)

RAG Status (Certainty around financial request and project delivery)	Green	High certainty on figures and project delivery
	Amber	Some certainty on figures and project delivery
	Red	Low certainty on figures and project delivery

Select "RAG Status"	Amber
---------------------	-------

Comments regarding RAG Status	As the outcome of work to scope alternative ways of providing services is delivered, achievable savings figures will become clearer.
--------------------------------------	--

Benchmarking

Supporting benchmarking information (Unit cost, demand stats, comparison to LAs, etc)	
--	--

Sign Off

Service Manager	-
Assistant Director	-
Director	Carol Cammiss, Director of Children's Services
Lead Member Briefed	Cllr Ullakarin Clark

Revenue Budget Setting 2021/22 to 2023/24

Directorate	Children's Services
--------------------	---------------------

Bid Details

Bid Type	Savings	Permanent reduction in expenditure or increase in income budget
Bid Name	Legal Review - Social Care & SEND	
Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	A review of the way legal services which support Children's Services are commissioned and delivered is underway following observation of steeply rising costs in recent years. Initial indications suggest that there is scope for realisation of savings to the value of the amounts indicated in this bid.	
Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref		
Impact if bid not successful		
Preparedness for implementation of savings		

Finance Information

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
		2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	(£125,000)	(£25,000)	£0
	Income	£0	£0	£0
<i>Cumulative movement from 20/21 budget</i>		(£125,000)	(£150,000)	(£150,000)

RAG Status (Certainty around financial request and project delivery)	Green	High certainty on figures and project delivery
	Amber	Some certainty on figures and project delivery
	Red	Low certainty on figures and project delivery

Select "RAG Status"	Amber
----------------------------	-------

Comments regarding RAG Status	As the project progresses, there will be more clarity about the changes needed to deliver savings, and the actual value of those savings. Savings are subject to assumptions about increased demand, which, if surpassed, may lead to additional unavoidable legal costs which will impact savings opportunities.
--------------------------------------	---

Benchmarking

Supporting benchmarking information (Unit cost, demand stats, comparison to LAs, etc)	
--	--

Sign Off

Service Manager	Estelle Kelleway / Sonia Aulak
Assistant Director	Adam Davis / Sal Thirlway
Director	Carol Cammiss, Director of Children's Services
Lead Member Briefed	Cllr Ullakarin Clark

Revenue Budget Setting 2020/21 to 2022/23

Directorate: Communities, Insight & Change

Bid No.	Type	Bid Name	Cumulative movement from 20/21*			RAG Status
			2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	
CIC.1	Growth	Infrastructure - Security and Resilience: DMZ (De-Militarised Zone) into Azure (Microsoft Cloud), Virtual Firewalls, Azure sentinel	£57,000	£57,000	£57,000	Green
CIC.9	Growth	Infrastructure - Inflationary increase to software licence contracts at 4%	£55,000	£55,000	£55,000	Green
CIC.8	Growth	Unachievable 2019/20 income target - Land charges	£80,000	£80,000	£80,000	Green
CIC.4	Growth	Domestic Abuse	£185,000	£246,000	£246,000	Green
CIC.2	Growth	New Assistant Director role	£104,000	£104,000	£104,000	Green
CIC.33	Savings	Library Service efficiencies (Year 1 only).	(£107,000)	(£399,000)	(£399,000)	Amber
			£374,000	£143,000	£143,000	
		Please note the figure of £399k on Years 2 and 3 on the CIC 33 Libraries saving is erroneous and subject to change on review. It is shown to reconcile to previously reported figures				
		Total	£748,000	£286,000	£286,000	

45

Growth	£481,000	£542,000	£542,000
Invest to Save	£0	£0	£0
Savings	(£107,000)	(£399,000)	(£399,000)
Special Item	£0	£0	£0

* Special Items - Non Cumulative

Revenue Budget Setting 2021/22 to 2023/24

Directorate	Communities, Insight & Change
--------------------	-------------------------------

Bid Details

Bid Type	Growth	Permanent increase in expenditure or reduction in income budget
Bid Name	Infrastructure - Security and Resilience: DMZ (De-Militarised Zone) into Azure (Microsoft Cloud), Virtual Firewalls, Azure sentinel	
Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	<p>Required for security and resiliency within Azure, enable us to extend external endpoints DMZ into Azure, Resiliency if Shute End/Waterford House is lost</p> <p>Move DMZ into Azure - would increase Azure annual spend- £30k Virtual firewalls - would increase Azure annual spend - £12k Azure sentinel - £15k</p>	
Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref		
Impact if bid not successful	Have no way of collated security logs, this gives us single pain of glass visibility with AI to mitigate risks	
Additional comments		

Finance Information

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
		2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	£57,000	£0	£0
	Income	£0	£0	£0
<i>Cumulative movement from 20/21 budget</i>		£57,000	£57,000	£57,000

RAG Status (Certainty around financial request and project delivery)	Green	High certainty on figures and project delivery
	Amber	Some certainty on figures and project delivery
	Red	Low certainty on figures and project delivery

Select "RAG Status"	Green
----------------------------	-------

Comments regarding RAG Status	
--------------------------------------	--

Benchmarking

Supporting benchmarking information (Unit cost, demand stats, comparison to LAs, etc)	
--	--

Sign Off

Service Manager	Glynn Davies
Assistant Director	Sally Watkins
Director	Keeley Clements, Director of Communities, Insight & Change
Lead Member Briefed	Cllr Gregor Murray

Revenue Budget Setting 2021/22 to 2023/24

Directorate	Communities, Insight & Change
--------------------	-------------------------------

Bid Details

Bid Type	Growth	Permanent increase in expenditure or reduction in income budget
Bid Name	Infrastructure - Inflationary increase to software licence contracts at 4%	
Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	The current payments relating to licence payments	
Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref		
Impact if bid not successful	Budget pressures due to inflation	
Additional comments		

Finance Information

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
		2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	£55,000	£0	£0
	Income	£0	£0	£0
<i>Cumulative movement from 20/21 budget</i>		£55,000	£55,000	£55,000

RAG Status (Certainty around financial request and project delivery)	Green	High certainty on figures and project delivery
	Amber	Some certainty on figures and project delivery
	Red	Low certainty on figures and project delivery

Select "RAG Status" Green

Comments regarding RAG Status	
--------------------------------------	--

Benchmarking

Supporting benchmarking information (Unit cost, demand stats, comparison to LAs, etc)	
--	--

Sign Off

Service Manager	Glynn Davies
Assistant Director	Sally Watkins
Director	Keeley Clements, Director of Communities, Insight & Change
Lead Member Briefed	Cllr Gregor Murray

Revenue Budget Setting 2021/22 to 2023/24

Directorate	Communities, Insight & Change
--------------------	-------------------------------

Bid Details

Bid Type	Growth	Permanent increase in expenditure or reduction in income budget
Bid Name	Unachievable 2019/20 income target - Land charges	
Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	Nearly 60% of Land Charges business is now going to personal search agents. This is trend also seen by other Berkshire LA's. They offer conveyancers the service for a lower price, albeit they are not 'official' searches. Our fees are comparable with neighbouring LA's (benchmarked). The existing budget figure is unattainable, even with huge improvements to the service, and reduction in cost to deliver, this level of income has not been achieved for over 7 years.	
Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref	<p>Other Berkshire LA's are seeing the same trends. Government now offering a stamp duty holiday (up to £500k purchase price) which could help revive the housing market, resulting in an increase in the number of searches. Liaising with developers like Crest Nicholson, around trends and gauging the market. The increase in job losses may have a negative impact on the housing market going forward, leading developers to tightly control the level of homes built.</p>	
Impact if bid not successful	The unattainable target will lead to a permanent overspend in this area.	
Additional comments	We have taken further action to market the service, in order to maximise income levels. All conveyancers were contacted, as soon as the lockdown was lifted around viewing properties, to market and promote our service. We now offer an expediated service to conveyancers - quicker turn around, for a higher fee. We have brought in separate commercial and land search fees, to maximise income.	

Finance Information

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
		2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	£80,000	£0	£0
	Income	£0	£0	£0
<i>Cumulative movement from 20/21 budget</i>		£80,000	£80,000	£80,000

RAG Status (Certainty around financial request and project delivery)	Green	High certainty on figures and project delivery
	Amber	Some certainty on figures and project delivery
	Red	Low certainty on figures and project delivery

Select "RAG Status"	Green
----------------------------	-------

Comments regarding RAG Status	
--------------------------------------	--

Benchmarking

Supporting benchmarking information (Unit cost, demand stats, comparison to LAs, etc)	
--	--

Sign Off

Service Manager	Jackie Whitney
Assistant Director	Nick Austin
Director	Keeley Clements, Director of Communities, Insight & Change
Lead Member Briefed	Cllr Gregor Murray

Revenue Budget Setting 2021/22 to 2023/24

Directorate	Communities, Insight & Change
-------------	-------------------------------

Bid Details

Bid Type	Growth	Permanent increase in expenditure or reduction in income budget
Bid Name	Domestic Abuse	
Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	A service review has made a number of recommendations on increased levels of investment needed in commissioned specialist services in order to fulfil the growing need for specialist provision in Wokingham. There is an upward trajectory of referrals is highly likely to continue to increase, therefore WBC needs an increase in funding to commission services with this in mind. The Domestic Abuse Bill will place a statutory duty on local authorities to provide support to victims and survivors of domestic abuse – and their children.	

Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref	<p>The growth bid is required to ensure capacity to deliver an effective domestic abuse service to meet the projected rise in demand represents an increase in the current contract value. This is based on an assumed current case load of 394.</p> <p>When factoring in projected increase in demand, a case load of 594 is estimated by 2022/23.</p> <p>Demand for domestic abuse services</p> <table style="font-size: x-small; width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Total</th> <th>% increase on previous year</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2019-20</td> <td>304</td> <td>60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2020-21</td> <td>380</td> <td>25%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2021-22</td> <td>475</td> <td>25%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2022-23</td> <td>594</td> <td>25%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Total	% increase on previous year	2019-20	304	60%	2020-21	380	25%	2021-22	475	25%	2022-23	594	25%
Year	Total	% increase on previous year														
2019-20	304	60%														
2020-21	380	25%														
2021-22	475	25%														
2022-23	594	25%														

Impact if bid not successful	We may not be able to adequately respond or identify Domestic Abuse referrals
-------------------------------------	---

Additional comments	A strategic review of current domestic abuse services and re-commission, based on meeting the projected increase in demand is being undertaken. In order to ensure the best service is commissioned for local residents, which is in line with best practice, the newly commissioned domestic abuse service specification will be informed by the reviews findings and subsequent recommendations
----------------------------	---

Finance Information

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
		2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	£185,000	£61,000	£0
	Income	£0	£0	£0
<i>Cumulative movement from 20/21 budget</i>		£185,000	£246,000	£246,000

RAG Status (Certainty around financial request and project delivery)	Green	High certainty on figures and project delivery
	Amber	Some certainty on figures and project delivery
	Red	Low certainty on figures and project delivery

Select "RAG Status"	Green
----------------------------	-------

Comments regarding RAG Status	
--------------------------------------	--

Benchmarking

Supporting benchmarking information (Unit cost, demand stats, comparison to LAs, etc)	<p>£45K Creation of a domestic abuse role within WBC to have strategic overview of domestic abuse response, implement the findings from the review and the Domestic Homicide Review.</p> <p>£140k Increase in commissioned services based on a likely 25% increase in cases with a minimal service model and a 38% increase cost per case to meet good practice for estimated (475 cases). This is based on a service cost of £514 per case (1.5FTE Independent Domestic Abuse Advisor, 1 Outreach worker, 1FTE Children's and Young People worker, 0.5 FTE Perpetrator worker & 0.5fte standard risk officer) + £21k Refuge cost.</p>
--	--

Sign Off

Service Manager	Narinder Brar
Assistant Director	Nicholas Austin
Director	Keeley Clements, Director of Communities, Insight & Change
Lead Member Briefed	Cllr Gregor Murray

Revenue Budget Setting 2021/22 to 2023/24

Directorate	Communities, Insight & Change
--------------------	-------------------------------

Bid Details

Bid Type	Growth	Permanent increase in expenditure or reduction in income budget
Bid Name	New Assistant Director role	
Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	<p>This bid is to support the new Assistant Director role in CIC. Through the creation of the CIC Directorate, it has been identified that a 3rd Assistant Director post is required to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Enhance the Council's approach to customer centricity, including effective and responsive service delivery -Ensure customer experience is paramount in relation to the Council Plan objectives of "Changing the way we work for you" -Lead the data & insight approach to ensure this is harnessed to aid strategic and operational decision making -Create the level of senior resource in CIC is sufficient to support the Directorate staffing levels and strategic aims (circa 270) 	
Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref		
Impact if bid not successful		
Additional comments		

Finance Information

		Yr 1 2021/22	Yr 2 2022/23	Yr 3 2023/24
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	£104,000	£0	£0
	Income	£0	£0	£0
<i>Cumulative movement from 20/21 budget</i>		£104,000	£104,000	£104,000

RAG Status (Certainty around financial request and project delivery)	Green	High certainty on figures and project delivery
	Amber	Some certainty on figures and project delivery
	Red	Low certainty on figures and project delivery

Select "RAG Status"	Green
----------------------------	-------

Comments regarding RAG Status	
--------------------------------------	--

Benchmarking

Supporting benchmarking information (Unit cost, demand stats, comparison to LAs, etc)	
--	--

Sign Off

Service Manager	Jackie Whitney
Assistant Director	Nick Austin
Director	Keeley Clements, Director of Communities, Insight & Change
Lead Member Briefed	Cllr Gregor Murray

Revenue Budget Setting 2021/22 to 2023/24

Directorate	Communities, Insight & Change
--------------------	-------------------------------

Bid Details

Bid Type	Savings	Permanent reduction in expenditure or increase in income budget
Bid Name	Library Service efficiencies (Year 1 only).	
Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	The success of our library service digital offer and our continuous improvement programme mean that there are opportunities to deliver further efficiencies across the service, Savings will come from things such as optimising libraries budget, our stock ordering, self service, staff resourcing and optimising opening hours to our most convenient times for residents. Years 2 and 3 are speculative and will be refined through the budget setting process as we develop innovative alternative delivery models.	
Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref	Please note the figures for Years 2 and 3 are now shown in error and are provided to reconcile back to previously reported figures. These will be adjusted before the final budget papers are submitted.	
Impact if bid not successful	Savings will have to be found elsewhere with a greater effect on frontline services	
Preparedness for implementation of savings	Plans are being developed to meet year 1 savings, Years 2 and 3 are speculative and will be refined through the budget setting process.	

Finance Information

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
		2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	(£107,000)	(£292,000)	£0
	Income	£0	£0	£0
<i>Cumulative movement from 20/21 budget</i>		(£107,000)	(£399,000)	(£399,000)

RAG Status (Certainty around financial request and project delivery)	Green	High certainty on figures and project delivery
	Amber	Some certainty on figures and project delivery
	Red	Low certainty on figures and project delivery

Select "RAG Status"	Amber
----------------------------	-------

Comments regarding RAG Status	Plans for the majority of additional savings have already been identified. Years 2 and 3 savings are still subject to confirmation
--------------------------------------	---

Benchmarking

Supporting benchmarking information (Unit cost, demand stats, comparison to LAs, etc)	
--	--

Sign Off

Service Manager	Mark Redfearn
Assistant Director	Nicholas Austin
Director	Keeley Clements, Director of Communities, Insight & Change
Lead Member Briefed	Cllr Gregor Murray

This page is intentionally left blank

Revenue Budget Setting 2021/22 to 2023/24

Directorate	Resources and Assets
--------------------	----------------------

Bid Details

Bid Type	Growth	Permanent increase in expenditure or reduction in income budget
-----------------	--------	---

Bid Name	Operational cost of relocation of the Youth Offending Service and the Family Intervention Resources and Support Team and lost income from Wokingham business centre
-----------------	---

Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	This bid is to account for the additional revenue costs of providing accommodation for the Youth Offending Service and the Family Intervention Resources and Support Team (who currently occupy the Family Resource Centre (83-85 Finchampstead Road)). The Family Resource Centre is being demolished as part of the South Wokingham Distributor Road Western Gateway, with start on site expected to be March 2021. Operationally the Youth Offending Service and Family Intervention Resources and Support Team should not be located in the same building due to their particular client base and the sensitivity around those uses. Additionally no suitable alternative accommodation to meet both needs in one property has been identified.
---	---

Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref	The total annual running costs across both 12 Rectory Road and Wokingham Business Centre have been estimated at £56,085
---	---

Impact if bid not successful	This will cause budget pressures in the service as highways has authority through planning permission to construct South Wokingham distributor road and this requires the demolishing of some sites, including the family resource centre. Operational property has to run the two new sites to be used going forward.
-------------------------------------	--

Additional comments	
----------------------------	--

Finance Information

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
		2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	£56,085	£0	£0
	Income	£0	£0	£0
<i>Cumulative movement from 20/21 budget</i>		£56,085	£56,085	£56,085

RAG Status (Certainty around financial request and project delivery)	Green	High certainty on figures and project delivery
	Amber	Some certainty on figures and project delivery
	Red	Low certainty on figures and project delivery

Select "RAG Status" Green

Comments regarding RAG Status	The running costs outlined above are estimated. The project, in respect of the SWDR Western Gateway and the need for the relocation has a high degree of certainty in terms of delivery.
--------------------------------------	--

Benchmarking

Supporting benchmarking information (Unit cost, demand stats, comparison to LAs, etc)	
--	--

Sign Off

Service Manager	Rodney Hing
Assistant Director	Bernie Pich
Director	Graham Ebers, Deputy Chief Executive
Lead Member Briefed	Cllr John Kaiser

Revenue Budget Setting 2021/22 to 2023/24

Directorate	Resources and Assets
--------------------	----------------------

Bid Details

Bid Type	Growth	Permanent increase in expenditure or reduction in income budget
Bid Name	Finance liaison support to social care services.	
Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	The trial period for the finance liaison officers (FLO) in Social Care services has completed and the value to the services has been demonstrated and these posts now have been established. This leaves a budget shortfall that is addressed by this growth bid and removes the internal charging to the social care services for which they have no budget.	
Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref		
Impact if bid not successful	The creation of the FLOs in both ASC and Childrens Services has brought a more robust and controlled financial support to those directorates. This will be lost if the posts are now not established.	
Additional comments		

Finance Information

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
		2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	£140,000	£0	£0
	Income	£0	£0	£0
<i>Cumulative movement from 20/21 budget</i>		£140,000	£140,000	£140,000

RAG Status (Certainty around financial request and project delivery)	Green	High certainty on figures and project delivery
	Amber	Some certainty on figures and project delivery
	Red	Low certainty on figures and project delivery

Select "RAG Status"	Green
----------------------------	-------

Comments regarding RAG Status	
--------------------------------------	--

Benchmarking

Supporting benchmarking information (Unit cost, demand stats, comparison to LAs, etc)	
--	--

Sign Off

Service Manager	Bob Watson - Head of Finance
Assistant Director	Post Vacant
Director	Graham Ebers, Deputy Chief Executive
Lead Member Briefed	Cllr John Kaiser

Revenue Budget Setting 2021/22 to 2023/24

Directorate	Resources and Assets
--------------------	----------------------

Bid Details

Bid Type	Growth	Permanent increase in expenditure or reduction in income budget
-----------------	--------	---

Bid Name	Creation of budget to underwrite the demand growth in administration and case owners across council
-----------------	---

Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	Since the C21 programme and the decision not to move the social care directorates onto a self-serve model, the demand for case owner support has increased from the original establishment envisaged during the transformation programme. Initially this was assumed to be funded from budgets within the care directorates, but this budget is not available and therefore this bid seeks to address the shortfall in the service budget.
---	--

Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref	
---	--

Impact if bid not successful	Staff already engaged would have to be let go and support to the frontline directorates will be reduced or removed in entirety.
-------------------------------------	---

Additional comments	
----------------------------	--

Finance Information

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
		2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	£50,000	£0	£0
	Income	£0	£0	£0
Cumulative movement from 20/21 budget		£50,000	£50,000	£50,000

RAG Status (Certainty around financial request and project delivery)	Green	High certainty on figures and project delivery
	Amber	Some certainty on figures and project delivery
	Red	Low certainty on figures and project delivery

Select "RAG Status"	Green
----------------------------	-------

Comments regarding RAG Status	
--------------------------------------	--

Benchmarking

Supporting benchmarking information (Unit cost, demand stats, comparison to LAs, etc)	
--	--

Sign Off

Service Manager	Bob Watson - Head of Finance
Assistant Director	Post Vacant
Director	Graham Ebers, Deputy Chief Executive
Lead Member Briefed	Cllr John Kaiser

Revenue Budget Setting 2021/22 to 2023/24

Directorate	Resources and Assets
-------------	----------------------

Bid Details

Bid Type	Growth	Permanent increase in expenditure or reduction in income budget
-----------------	--------	---

Bid Name	SLS - Resource required to meet demand for legal services
Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	Demand on services from RBWM has fallen significantly since 2017/2018. Likewise services demand from WBC has increased. RBWM contribution next year will be near to £600k. We are unable to calculate contribution until at least month 9 as contribution is based upon previous years use. Current contribution from 'budget' is £670k even though RBWM actual has been sub £600k for 2 out of 3 years and is expected to be near £555k (based on month 2 figures) when including impact of redeployment due to covid.

Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref	Financial and performance over last 3 financial year 1. RBWM contribution: £592k (41%), £653k (44%), £555k (36%) . 2. WBC contribution: £870k (59%), £786k (56%), £882k (67%). 3. % Hours provided to both parties v capacity hours: 121%, 103%, 144%. 4. Contribution budget 20/21: £670k v £620k expected (ignoring further impact from Covid)
---	--

Impact if bid not successful	We will need to make redundancies of approximately 1.5 fee earners. This comes with a simultaneous loss of 1,800 hours. As currently there is a demand from WBC for these hours as the service is providing hours in excess of capacity. Presumably therefore the demand will continue and require WBC to seek external legal advice at a conservative increase of 100% of current cost. As such, if demand remains the same there will be net additional cost of £70k. By investing £70k WBC will be saving a further 70k.
-------------------------------------	---

Additional comments	
----------------------------	--

Finance Information

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
		2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	£70,000	£0	£0
	Income	£0	£0	£0
Cumulative movement from 20/21 budget		£70,000	£70,000	£70,000

RAG Status (Certainty around financial request and project delivery)	Green	High certainty on figures and project delivery
	Amber	Some certainty on figures and project delivery
	Red	Low certainty on figures and project delivery

Select "RAG Status" Green

Comments regarding RAG Status	The above includes the assumption that the contract with RBWM will renew in March 2021.
--------------------------------------	---

Benchmarking

Supporting benchmarking information (Unit cost, demand stats, comparison to LAs, etc)	In 19/20 SLS cost was £1,438,000 (excluding income). SLS delivered 28,954 hours. This mean the blended hourly rate is £52 per hour. WBC current has two external legal frameworks (using Surrey framework and LLG framework). The reduced rates on the framework are £100 solicitor, £140 Associate Solicitor and £160 Partner per hour.
--	--

Sign Off

Service Manager	Sean O'Connor
Assistant Director	Post Vacant
Director	Graham Ebers, Deputy Chief Executive
Lead Member Briefed	Cllr John Kaiser

Revenue Budget Setting 2021/22 to 2023/24**Directorate**

Resources and Assets

Bid Details

Bid Type	Savings	Permanent reduction in expenditure or increase in income budget
-----------------	---------	---

Bid Name	Income generation from housing, regeneration and commercial investment in excess of financing costs - commercial properties
-----------------	---

Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	Delivery of £200m available for regeneration, housing and commercial investment. This is the revenue impact of the £200m investment 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	This saving outlined here are net of the debt financing cost of borrowing and also a statutory provision for possible capital losses known as a minimum revenue provision (MRP). Net Income £2.3m p.a has already been budgeted for through previous MTFP versions and budget approvals. 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 £200m. The Council's Property Investment Group is well established and functioning as per previous Council approval. The programme is already generating £1.73m p.a. (net of debt financing costs and MRP)
---	--

Finance Information

		Yr 1 2021/22	Yr 2 2022/23	Yr 3 2023/24
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	£0	£0	£0
	Income	(£960,000)	(£700,000)	£0
<i>Cumulative movement from 20/21 budget</i>		(£960,000)	(£1,660,000)	(£1,660,000)

RAG Status (Certainty around financial request and project delivery)	Green	High certainty on figures and project delivery
	Amber	Some certainty on figures and project delivery
	Red	Low certainty on figures and project delivery

Select "RAG Status"	Green
----------------------------	-------

Comments regarding RAG Status	
--------------------------------------	--

Benchmarking

Supporting benchmarking information (Unit cost, demand stats, comparison to LAs, etc)	
--	--

Sign Off

Service Manager	Irene Kearns
Assistant Director	Bernie Pich
Director	Graham Ebers, Deputy Chief Executive
Lead Member Briefed	Cllr John Kaiser

Revenue Budget Setting 2021/22 to 2023/24

Directorate	Resources and Assets
--------------------	----------------------

Bid Details

Bid Type	Savings	Permanent reduction in expenditure or increase in income budget
Bid Name	Expected income from the Wokingham Housing companies housing provision project	
Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	1,000 houses over four years with £5m investment, over and above the £200m investment fund. This is income from the development of housing within the borough by the Council through its wholly owned subsidiary companies and will be self-financing.	
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		
Preparedness for implementation of savings	Building on our current activities, a phased pipeline will be introduced.	

Finance Information

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
		2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	£0	£0	£0
	Income	(£200,000)	(£200,000)	£0
<i>Cumulative movement from 20/21 budget</i>		(£200,000)	(£400,000)	(£400,000)

RAG Status (Certainty around financial request and project delivery)	Green	High certainty on figures and project delivery
	Amber	Some certainty on figures and project delivery
	Red	Low certainty on figures and project delivery

Select "RAG Status" Green

Comments regarding RAG Status	
--------------------------------------	--

Benchmarking

Supporting benchmarking information (Unit cost, demand stats, comparison to LAs, etc)	
--	--

Sign Off

Service Manager	Irene Kearns
Assistant Director	Bernie Pich
Director	Graham Ebers, Deputy Chief Executive
Lead Member Briefed	Cllr John Kaiser

Revenue Budget Setting 2021/22 to 2023/24

Directorate	Resources and Assets
--------------------	----------------------

Bid Details

Bid Type	Savings	Permanent reduction in expenditure or increase in income budget
Bid Name	Solar income generation from existing solar assets	
Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	This is an increase in the income received by WBC from its existing solar assets.	
Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref	£70k is the average income earned from 2017/18 to 2019/20. Therefore the £80k annual income is sustainable.	
Impact if bid not successful	Loss of new revenue stream.	
Preparedness for implementation of savings	These are budgets for savings realisable from existing solar assets	

Finance Information

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
		2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	£0	£0	£0
	Income	(£80,000)	£0	£0
<i>Cumulative movement from 20/21 budget</i>		(£80,000)	(£80,000)	(£80,000)

RAG Status (Certainty around financial request and project delivery)	Green	High certainty on figures and project delivery
	Amber	Some certainty on figures and project delivery
	Red	Low certainty on figures and project delivery

Select "RAG Status" Green

Comments regarding RAG Status	
--------------------------------------	--

Benchmarking

Supporting benchmarking information (Unit cost, demand stats, comparison to LAs, etc)	
--	--

Sign Off

Service Manager	Ian Gough
Assistant Director	Bernie Pich
Director	Graham Ebers, Deputy Chief Executive
Lead Member Briefed	Cllr John Kaiser

Revenue Budget Setting 2021/22 to 2023/24

Directorate	Resources and Assets
--------------------	----------------------

Bid Details

Bid Type	Savings	Permanent reduction in expenditure or increase in income budget
Bid Name	Income generation from new Solar Farm	
Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	Carbon reduction agenda - Income generation from new Solar Farm infrastructures in Barkham, generating green energy and thus an income stream.	
Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref		
Impact if bid not successful		
Preparedness for implementation of savings	Construction lead times mean that savings will not be realised until 22/23, but will be ongoing.	

Finance Information

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
		2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	£0	(£300,000)	(£200,000)
	Income	£0	£0	£0
<i>Cumulative movement from 20/21 budget</i>		£0	(£300,000)	(£500,000)

RAG Status (Certainty around financial request and project delivery)	Green	High certainty on figures and project delivery
	Amber	Some certainty on figures and project delivery
	Red	Low certainty on figures and project delivery

Select "RAG Status"	Green
----------------------------	-------

Comments regarding RAG Status	
--------------------------------------	--

Benchmarking

Supporting benchmarking information (Unit cost, demand stats, comparison to LAs, etc)	
--	--

Sign Off

Service Manager	Ian Gough
Assistant Director	Bernie Pich
Director	Graham Ebers, Deputy Chief Executive
Lead Member Briefed	Cllr John Kaiser

Revenue Budget Setting 2021/22 to 2023/24

Directorate	Resources and Assets
--------------------	----------------------

Bid Details

Bid Type	Savings	Permanent reduction in expenditure or increase in income budget
Bid Name	Commercialisation – crematorium	
Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	Income generation from building an in-borough crematorium to meet increasing demand. This will generate an income stream.	
Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref	A number of studies have shown there is a need and opportunity for a crematorium within the borough supporting the needs of residents. This is a viable commercial opportunity and one that the Council is pursuing.	
Impact if bid not successful		
Preparedness for implementation of savings	Covid-19 priorities have impacted on the delivery of this bid - previously submitted, but now delaying the expected benefits to 22/23 and beyond.	

Finance Information

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
		2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	£0	(£110,000)	(£109,000)
	Income	£0	£0	£0
<i>Cumulative movement from 20/21 budget</i>		£0	(£110,000)	(£219,000)

RAG Status (Certainty around financial request and project delivery)	Green	High certainty on figures and project delivery
	Amber	Some certainty on figures and project delivery
	Red	Low certainty on figures and project delivery

Select "RAG Status" Green

Comments regarding RAG Status	
--------------------------------------	--

Benchmarking

Supporting benchmarking information (Unit cost, demand stats, comparison to LAs, etc)	
--	--

Sign Off

Service Manager	Rodney Hing
Assistant Director	Bernie Pich
Director	Graham Ebers, Deputy Chief Executive
Lead Member Briefed	Cllr John Kaiser

Revenue Budget Setting 2021/22 to 2023/24

Directorate	Resources and Assets
--------------------	----------------------

Bid Details

Bid Type	Savings	Permanent reduction in expenditure or increase in income budget
Bid Name	Early payment programme	
Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	WBC gain share from supplier early payment discount scheme. Partnership with Oxygen Finance is already in progress and this is the anticipated income stream.	
Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref	<p>The business model has an estimate of c.£1.2 million (being the WBC share) over its five year project life.</p> <p>This will also see an improvement in the Council's accounts payable processes and introduction of e-invoicing (a statutory requirement).</p>	
Impact if bid not successful		
Preparedness for implementation of savings	Programme is already under implementation to deliver savings and improved ways of working in our accounts payable processes.	

Finance Information

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
		2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	£0	£0	£0
	Income	(£55,000)	(£100,000)	(£45,000)
<i>Cumulative movement from 20/21 budget</i>		(£55,000)	(£155,000)	(£200,000)

RAG Status (Certainty around financial request and project delivery)	Green	High certainty on figures and project delivery
	Amber	Some certainty on figures and project delivery
	Red	Low certainty on figures and project delivery

Select "RAG Status"	Green
----------------------------	-------

Comments regarding RAG Status	Move to a early payment discount scheme could be impacted by current level of support to local businesses due to Covid-19.
--------------------------------------	--

Benchmarking

Supporting benchmarking information (Unit cost, demand stats, comparison to LAs, etc)	
--	--

Sign Off

Service Manager	Bob Watson - Head of Finance
Assistant Director	Post Vacant
Director	Graham Ebers, Deputy Chief Executive
Lead Member Briefed	Cllr John Kaiser

Revenue Budget Setting 2021/22 to 2023/24

Directorate	Resources and Assets
--------------------	----------------------

Bid Details

Bid Type	Savings	Permanent reduction in expenditure or increase in income budget
Bid Name	Deletion of Assistant Director Business Services (AD BS) post	
Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	<p>Following the departure of the previous incumbent in the AD Business Services role, the service has been reviewed and reorganised.</p> <p>The Lead Specialist for Legal Services now reports to the AD Governance, the Lead Specialist for Operational Property now report to the AD Property. The HR specialists have moved to CIC directorate. The Lead Specialist Finance has now taken the management of the Case Owner Team, the Digital Solutions team and the Procurement team that has moved from CIC.</p> <p>This is will allow the AD Business Services role to be deleted generating a cost saving to the Council.</p>	
Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref	Not applicable	
Impact if bid not successful	Not applicable - savings already being made.	
Preparedness for implementation of savings	The post is already vacant - there are no redundancy implications	

Finance Information

		Yr 1 2021/22	Yr 2 2022/23	Yr 3 2023/24
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	(£85,000)	£0	£0
	Income	£0	£0	£0
<i>Cumulative movement from 20/21 budget</i>		(£85,000)	(£85,000)	(£85,000)

RAG Status (Certainty around financial request and project delivery)	Green	High certainty on figures and project delivery
	Amber	Some certainty on figures and project delivery
	Red	Low certainty on figures and project delivery

Select "RAG Status"	Green
----------------------------	-------

Comments regarding RAG Status	
--------------------------------------	--

Benchmarking

Supporting benchmarking information (Unit cost, demand stats, comparison to LAs, etc)	
--	--

Sign Off

Service Manager	Bob Watson - Head of Finance
Assistant Director	Post vacant
Director	Graham Ebers, Deputy Chief Executive
Lead Member Briefed	Cllr John Kaiser

Revenue Budget Setting 2021/22 to 2023/24

Directorate	Resources and Assets
--------------------	----------------------

Bid Details

Bid Type	Savings	Permanent reduction in expenditure or increase in income budget
Bid Name	Reduction of treasury management debt costs	
Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	During FY 21/22 there will be a full review of external and internal debt, internal treasury balances and cash flow timing to optimise treasury management position and to reduce the debt cost of capital and the potential refinancing of debt with lower cost PWLB debt.	
Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref	Treasury officers regularly review the debt and investment portfolios, but a full root and branch review is now due. The Council will also make use of its retained treasury advisers for this work.	
Impact if bid not successful		
Preparedness for implementation of savings	Work is already underway, and once the full impact of the PWLB review is known, the opportunity to refinance some of the Council's debt will be taken.	

Finance Information

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
		2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	(£350,000)	£0	£0
	Income	£0	£0	£0
<i>Cumulative movement from 20/21 budget</i>		(£350,000)	(£350,000)	(£350,000)

RAG Status (Certainty around financial request and project delivery)	Green	High certainty on figures and project delivery
	Amber	Some certainty on figures and project delivery
	Red	Low certainty on figures and project delivery

Select "RAG Status" Green

Comments regarding RAG Status	The primary concern of any Council investment is security and the Council's funds should not be jeopardised in pursuit of higher returns.
--------------------------------------	---

Benchmarking

Supporting benchmarking information (Unit cost, demand stats, comparison to LAs, etc)	
--	--

Sign Off

Service Manager	Martin Jones
Assistant Director	Post Vacant
Director	Graham Ebers, Deputy Chief Executive
Lead Member Briefed	Cllr John Kaiser

Revenue Budget Setting 2021/22 to 2023/24

Directorate	Resources and Assets
--------------------	----------------------

Bid Details

Bid Type	Savings	Permanent reduction in expenditure or increase in income budget
Bid Name	Leisure - increased income from enhancement of Cantley Park facilities and additional activities	
Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	With the new 3G football pitch and upgrade on the pavillion (including café) there will be an increase in the income received from the Cantley Park leisure area. As there will be drainage for the pitches, these will be useable all season, with additional parking and a children's play area.	
Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref	In the 'Play and pitch' strategy it was identified that new 3G is needed so Wokingham resident players can stay in borough using pitches all year round.	
Impact if bid not successful	Loss of potential income due to inadequate facility for all season	
Preparedness for implementation of savings	The savings will be manged into the capital project as it progresses.	

Finance Information

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
		2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	£0	£0	£0
	Income	(£100,000)	£0	£0
<i>Cumulative movement from 20/21 budget</i>		(£100,000)	(£100,000)	(£100,000)

RAG Status (Certainty around financial request and project delivery)	Green	High certainty on figures and project delivery
	Amber	Some certainty on figures and project delivery
	Red	Low certainty on figures and project delivery

Select "RAG Status"	Green
----------------------------	-------

Comments regarding RAG Status	
--------------------------------------	--

Benchmarking

Supporting benchmarking information (Unit cost, demand stats, comparision to LAs, etc)	
---	--

Sign Off

Service Manager	Beverley Thomson
Assistant Director	Post Vacant
Director	Graham Ebers, Deputy Chief Executive
Lead Member Briefed	Cllr Parry Bath

Revenue Budget Setting 2021/22 to 2023/24

Directorate	Resources and Assets
--------------------	----------------------

Bid Details

Bid Type	Savings	Permanent reduction in expenditure or increase in income budget
-----------------	---------	---

Bid Name	Review of fees and charges for Leisure services (outside main contract) - New Programmes
-----------------	--

Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	New and revised fees and charges are proposed in the fees and charges report that will be presented to Executive at the end of November 2020. Programmes include: Older people exercise program (SHINE), prevention programmes, Wokingham Active Kids, disability for children and adults, socialisation in care homes and new activities including indoor and outdoor cinema, ice rinks and events.
---	--

Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref	<p>These fees and charges have been assessed following benchmarking exercises with similar authorities.</p> <p>Virtual classes – from an activity library that members can access in their own time.</p> <p>Events – workshops/activity events/guest activities/social events (examples of activities will include: Dance/Pilates/Yoga/Tai Chi/Nordic Walking)</p> <p>Workshops – morning/afternoon/all day workshops with existing and guest instructors.</p> <p>Benchmarking examples for workshops Triyoga London : £20 - £45 for 2 hours + 7 day online access. Inclaba Yoga Studio: £20 online and £45 in person for a 3 hour workshops</p>
---	--

Impact if bid not successful	Loss of income from other activities
-------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

Preparedness for implementation of savings	
---	--

Finance Information

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
		2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	(£198,000)		£0
	Income	£0	£0	£0
<i>Cumulative movement from 2021 budget</i>		(£198,000)	(£198,000)	(£198,000)

RAG Status (Certainty around financial request and project delivery)	Green	High certainty on figures and project delivery
	Amber	Some certainty on figures and project delivery
	Red	Low certainty on figures and project delivery

Select "RAG Status"	Green
----------------------------	-------

Comments regarding RAG Status	
--------------------------------------	--

Benchmarking

Supporting benchmarking information (Unit cost, demand stats, comparison to LAs, etc)	Benchmarking exercises have been undertaken and Wokingham BC's leisure offer has been compared with similar authorities.
--	--

Sign Off

Service Manager	Bev Thompson
Assistant Director	Post Vacant
Director	Graham Ebers, Deputy Chief Executive
Lead Member Briefed	Cllr Parry Bath

Revenue Budget Setting 2021/22 to 2023/24

Directorate	Resources and Assets
--------------------	----------------------

Bid Details

Bid Type	Savings	Permanent reduction in expenditure or increase in income budget
Bid Name	Review of fees and charges for Leisure services (outside main contract) - 30% increase	
Description of Bid Inc. (Reason for Bid i.e. Demand / Legislative / Discretionary)	Revised fees and charges are proposed in the fees and charges report that will be presented to Executive at the end of November 2020.	
Supporting Evidence / Trend Analysis / Business Case ref	These fees and charges have been assessed following benchmarking exercises with similar authorities.	
Impact if bid not successful		
Preparedness for implementation of savings		

Finance Information

		Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
		2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
Amount needed per year	Expenditure	(£129,000)	£0	£0
	Income	£0	£0	£0
<i>Cumulative movement from 20/21 budget</i>		(£129,000)	(£129,000)	(£129,000)

RAG Status (Certainty around financial request and project delivery)	Green	High certainty on figures and project delivery
	Amber	Some certainty on figures and project delivery
	Red	Low certainty on figures and project delivery

Select "RAG Status"	Green
----------------------------	-------

Comments regarding RAG Status	Benchmarking exercises have been undertaken and Wokingham BC's leisure offer has been compared with similar authorities.
--------------------------------------	--

Benchmarking

Supporting benchmarking information (Unit cost, demand stats, comparison to LAs, etc)	
--	--

Sign Off

Service Manager	Beverley Thompson
Assistant Director	Post Vacant
Director	Graham Ebers, Deputy Chief Executive
Lead Member Briefed	Cllr Parry Bath

Upcoming Meetings' Work Programme

DATE OF MEETING	ITEM	PURPOSE OF REPORT	REASON FOR CONSIDERATION	CONTACT OFFICER
22 December 2020, Extraordinary	MTFP 2021-24	To receive the Capital programme, special items and updated revenue position	Work Programme	Graham Ebers
	May 2021 Elections Update	To inform the Committee of the arrangements for the May 2021 elections including the timing of the counts	Work Programme	Andrew Moulton
	Council Tax Reduction Scheme	To consider the proposed Council Tax Reduction Scheme for 2021/22	Committee Request	Nicky Thomas
	Work Programme	To consider the work programme for the Committee for 2020/21	Standing Item	Democratic Services

DATE OF MEETING	ITEM	PURPOSE OF REPORT	REASON FOR CONSIDERATION	CONTACT OFFICER
19 January 2021, Extraordinary	MTFP 2021-24	To discuss the final positions of the proposed Revenue and Capital programmes	Work Programme	Graham Ebers
	Audit Shared Service	To receive an update on the Audit shared service	Work Programme	Andrew Moulton
	Work Programme	To consider the work programme for the Committee for 2020/21	Standing Item	Democratic Services