



**WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**MINUTES OF COMMITTEE MEETINGS
FOR THE PERIOD**

1 June 2017 to 3 July 2017

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Andy Couldrick', is positioned above the printed name.

Andy Couldrick
Chief Executive
Published on 12 July 2017



WOKINGHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL

Our Vision

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

Our Priorities

Improve educational attainment and focus on every child achieving their potential

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

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

Tackle traffic congestion in specific areas of the Borough

Improve the customer experience when accessing Council services

The Underpinning Principles

Offer excellent value for your Council Tax

Provide affordable homes

Look after the vulnerable

Improve health, wellbeing and quality of life

Maintain and improve the waste collection, recycling and fuel efficiency

Deliver quality in all that we do

	PAGE NO.
Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee Monday, 5 June 2017	5 - 10
Audit Committee, Tuesday, 13 June 2017	11 - 16
Planning Committee Wednesday, 14 June 2017	17 - 22
Health and Wellbeing Board Thursday, 15 June 2017	23 - 28
Community and Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Monday, 19 June 2017 Committee	29 - 32
Children's Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee Tuesday, 20 June 2017	33 - 38
Executive Thursday, 29 June 2017	39 - 52
Personnel Board Thursday, 29 June 2017	53 - 56
Licensing and Appeals Committee Monday, 3 July 2017	57 - 60

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
HELD ON 5 JUNE 2017 FROM 7.00 PM TO 8.55 PM**

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Ken Miall (Chairman), Kate Haines (Vice-Chairman), Parry Batth, Laura Blumenthal, John Jarvis, Clive Jones, Malcolm Richards, Chris Smith and Bill Soane

Others Present

Jim Stockley, Healthwatch
Nicola Strudley, Healthwatch
Katie Summers, Wokingham CCG
Dr Johan Zylstra, Wokingham CCG
Madeleine Shopland, Principal Democratic Services Officer
Darrell Gale, Consultant in Public Health
Sarah O'Connor, Service Manager, Adult Safeguarding
Mark Cupit, Assistant Director Delivery and Infrastructure
Helen Clark, Director of Primary Care Berkshire West CCG
Phillip Sharpe, Assistant Director Adult's Services

1. APOLOGIES

An apology for absence was submitted from Councillor John Kaiser.

2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 8 March 2017 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

With regards to the number of individuals with learning difficulties who were living with elderly parents within the Borough, Councillor Blumenthal commented that Officers had indicated that numbers were quite low.

3. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

4. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no public questions.

5. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

There were no Member questions.

**6. WEST BERKSHIRE SAFEGUARDING ADULTS BOARD ANNUAL REPORT
2015-2016 AND WOKINGHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL'S (WBC) ADULT
SAFEGUARDING REPORT 2015-2016**

The Committee received the West Berkshire Safeguarding Adults Board Annual Report 2015-2016 and Wokingham Borough Council's Adult Safeguarding Report 2015-2016.

During the discussion of this item, the following points were made:

- Key performance indicators and measures had been embedded to enable more accurate analysis and monitoring.
- Members were informed that the implementation of the quality assurance frameworks had demonstrated a significant commitment from staff and leaders

within the Council. As a result of this, the Council had met the requirements of the Care Act 2014 and promoted the Making Safeguarding Personal agenda.

- A full review had been undertaken by the Association of Directors for Adult Social Services in the form of a peer review. The report had noted the innovation of the Council and its workforce.
- The Committee was pleased to note that the strategic developments within the Deprivation of Liberty Safeguarding service had been cited as innovative in design.
- The number of safeguarding concerns continued to increase year on year. However, over half the concerns were raised by social care and health staff. As in previous years, many of the enquiries related to people who were over 65 years old. The most common locations where the alleged abuse took place were a person's own home and a care home. The majority of concluded enquiries involved a source of risk known to the individual in Reading and West Berkshire but the source of risk in Wokingham was social care support.
- The priorities for Wokingham for 2016-17 were outlined.
- Sarah O'Connor took the Committee through the West Berkshire Safeguarding Adults Board Annual Report 2015-2016.
- It was noted that the Board had commissioned two Safeguarding Adults Reviews. Learning from these reviews had been delivered in all partner organisations.
- Members considered the West Berkshire Safeguarding Adults Board priorities for 2016-17.
- Councillor Smith asked about the proportion of DOLs applications received for Wokingham for July 2015 being above the national average. Sarah O'Connor commented that during that period a lot of proactive work had been undertaken with providers.
- In response to a question from Councillor Blumenthal regarding safeguarding concerns and enquiries, Sarah O'Connor stated that the Council would not want to see a high transfer from the number of safeguarding concerns to safeguarding referrals/S42 enquiries. At the point that a concern was raised assurance could often be given. The transferal rates for Wokingham were similar to other neighbouring local authorities.
- Councillor Jones noted that 1495 safeguarding concerns had been received in 2016-16 and 586 had transferred to safeguarding enquiries. He went on to ask whether any of those concerns that had not escalated to safeguarding enquiries were ever relooked at. Sarah O'Connor indicated that there was not a process or the capacity to do so. Members were assured that the governance and operational systems in place ensured that it was possible to see if issues were being re-raised.

RESOLVED: That the West Berkshire Safeguarding Adults Board Annual Report 2015-2016 and Wokingham Borough Council's Adult Safeguarding Report 2015-2016 be noted.

7. UPDATE ON PRIMARY CARE FACILITIES AT THE ARBORFIELD SDL

Members received an update on primary care facilities at the Arborfield Strategic Development Location (SDL).

Dr Zylstra declared that he was a partner in the Finchampstead practice.

During the discussion of this item, the following points were made:

- Mark Cupit, Assistant Director Delivery and Infrastructure explained that the Core Strategy 2010 had identified the four Strategic Development Locations (SDLs). Berkshire West Primary Care Trust had advised that a new GP practice might be

required. Arborfield would be the largest of the four SDL's at approximately 3500 new dwellings.

- The Council had generated policy and S106s had been negotiated with developers.
- Berkshire West PCT had been replaced and the way services delivered had changed. Members were informed that the commissioning of the primary health services within the SDL would be via the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG), with delivery by GPs on the traditional partnership model.
- The CCG planned to address GP requirements via enhancement of existing surgeries at Lower Earley, Finchampstead and Swallowfield. The CCG had bid for Estates Technology Infrastructure Funding and 66% of requirement had been awarded. Katie Summers, Director of Operations, Wokingham CCG commented that some practices had taken out personal loans in order to complete the necessary works.
- The Council had established an ongoing dialogue with the CCG.
- Members were informed that the SDL S106 for Health was £865,812, which was awaited.
- Mark Cupit explained that the Council had adopted the Community Infrastructure Levy from 6 April 2015. Wokingham had one of the highest CIL levels in the country at £480 per m². 100% of CIL was committed on known capital projects. Members noted what CIL could be spent on.
- Katie Summers, Director of Operations, Wokingham CCG provided an update on General Practice.
- The Committee was informed that demand for GP appointments had increased by 15% and that on average patients saw their GP 6 times a year. Members were told that on average a GP dealt with 100 patients a day if they were the duty doctor.
- The GP workforce was stretched. The number of those entering General Practice had decreased massively over the last ten years. Locally, Wokingham Borough had a number of GPs due to retire. Brookside Practice had had four GPs retire the previous year whilst another practice had had to advertise seven times to fill a vacancy.
- Patients' expectations had also increased.
- Larger, more resilient practices offering a greater range of services over extended hours were being developed. The whole of the health and social care sector would be brought together based on neighbourhood clusters.
- Members were updated on Primary Care Estates. It was noted that ownership of GP premises and land varied. The CCG did not hold land or property assets.
- The Borough's population was anticipated to grow by approximately 30,000 because of the SDL's and other growth. The CCG's priorities were to identify any existing spare built capacity available and to consider the potential to expand existing practice sites.
- It was proposed that the Committee be sent copies of The Grimes Report, a needs assessment for primary healthcare requirements in the Borough's Strategic Development Locations at Arborfield Garrison, South of M4, Wokingham North and Wokingham South, which had been carried out in 2014.
- With regards to the South of M4 and Arborfield SDLs notable existing spare built capacity had been identified at Shinfield practice and Shinfield, Finchampstead and Swallowfield practices had capacity to expand. There was potential extra capacity in these areas for 22,900 additional patients. With regards to the North and South SDLs, notable existing spare built capacity had been identified at Wokingham Medical Centre. Woosehill practice had scope to expand. There was potential extra capacity for 14,800 in these areas.

- Katie Summers highlighted the new model of care.
- The Committee discussed funding of general practice. Dr Zylstra indicated that much of the new funding from the Five Year Forward View was predicated on practices with a footprint of between 30-50,000 patients. Currently the largest practice in the Borough had approximately 28,000 patients. Helen Clark emphasised that clustering was still evolving.
- In response to a question regarding funding, Dr Zylstra indicated that the main funding stream was core service contract with NHS England (the “global sum.”). The Carr-Hill weighting formula was applied to practice populations to calculate the global sum. Wokingham received less per patient than many other areas in the country. Councillor Jones asked how the Carr-Hill formula was calculated. Helen Clark stated that various factors such as age of population were taken into account. Councillor Jones suggested that it would be helpful receive further explanation as to how the Carr-Hill formula was applied.
- Councillor Blumenthal asked how many patients were visiting their GP for social reasons. She was informed that whilst this did occur, numbers were quite small.
- Councillor Richards questioned whether there was a minimum size for GP practices. Helen Clark indicated that there were no national set requirements. Staffing levels were set by individual GP contracts; however practices would be unlikely to have less than 5,000 patients and ideally would have over 10,000 patients.
- Members asked about the number of patients per GP. Helen Clark stated that the number of patients per GP would increase. Nationally, on average there were 1850 per GP. Helen Clark agreed to clarify the figures for Wokingham. It was noted that Wilderness Road practice was the only singled handed practice in the Borough.
- Councillor Batth asked if there was sufficient dentistry provision within the Borough and was informed that this was commissioned by NHS England.
- Nicola Strudley questioned how the message that patients may not always be able to see their GP and that there were other practice staff who could assist, could be better disseminated. Dr Zylstra commented that a consistent message was needed.
- The Committee discussed practice boundaries.

RESOLVED: That the update be noted.

8. HEALTHWATCH WOKINGHAM BOROUGH - REVIEW OF EXTRA CARE SERVICES

Nicola Strudley presented Healthwatch Wokingham Borough’s report reviewing Extra Care Services.

During the discussion of this item, the following points were made:

- A number of factors had prompted Healthwatch Wokingham Borough to undertake a review of extra care facilities within the Borough, including the ageing population and an increase in loneliness.
- Two new extra care schemes were due to open in the Borough.
- Healthwatch Wokingham Borough, with the help of volunteer drivers, had undertaken a straw poll about whether people had given consideration as to where they would live if they were no longer able to live in their own homes. 95% of those who responded said that they had not. This decision was often taken at a time of crisis.

- Nicola Strudley commented that extra care meant different things to different people. Healthwatch had produced a fact sheet to assist.
- A Healthwatch Wokingham Borough project team had visited the three existing extra care facilities within the Borough, talking to residents and staff.
- Nicola Strudley took Members through the common themes that had emerged. She highlighted specific examples where residents had had issues with building design. For example, one resident had been scared to use their shower because the grab rails had suction cups and they were unconvinced of their safety. Another resident had an issue with bright sunlight streaming into their room during the middle of the day, making it necessary to move rooms.
- Darrell Gale expressed concerns regarding single aspects flats and the possibility of overheating in hot weather. He went on to state that this should be taken into consideration when planning policies were next reviewed.
- Nicola Strudley commented that although there were communal areas, they were not necessarily well used and that more could be done to encourage this.
- Managing residents' expectations had emerged as another theme. Some residents and family members had not appreciated the differences between care home facilities and extra care facilities.
- Some had raised transport links as a concern. It was noted that Readibus collected from Alexandra Place at Woodley to take residents into Woodley Town Centre. In the past residents had had around 4 hours to go shopping. However, timetables had changed meaning that this time had been cut to 45 minutes. Councillor Haines indicated that she would take the matter up with the Council's representative on Readibus.
- Councillor Blumenthal asked whether feedback on the report had been received. Members were informed that the interim commissioner who had responsibility for extra care had been provided with a copy and had indicated that standards would be level across all extra care facilities within the Borough.
- Councillor Haines questioned whether greater use could be made of the Council's Activity Coordinator.
- Councillor Soane asked about facilities for visiting family members.

RESOLVED: That the Healthwatch Wokingham Borough report reviewing Extra Care Services be noted.

9. HEALTH CONSULTATIONS

The Committee noted the consultation regarding the availability of gluten-free foods on NHS prescription.

Councillor Jarvis expressed concern at the price of NHS prescriptions for gluten-free foods.

RESOLVED: That the health consultation be noted.

10. FORWARD PROGRAMME 2017-18

The Committee considered the forward programme for the remainder of the municipal year.

During the discussion of this item, the following points were made:

- Members requested an update on the GP alliance in 6 months' time.

- Councillor Soane asked if the Committee could visit the Fosters extra care facility prior to its opening to see the design and facilities available.
- It was suggested that an update on dentistry, optometry and pharmacy provision in the Borough be requested from NHS England.
- Councillor Haines reminded Members that as corporate parents they needed to consider what impact matters had on the Borough's Looked After Children.

RESOLVED: That the forward programme be noted.

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
AUDIT COMMITTEE
HELD ON 13 JUNE 2017 FROM 7.00 PM TO 8.40 PM**

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Anthony Pollock (Chairman), Prue Bray, UllaKarin Clark and Barrie Patman

Also Present

Madeleine Shopland, Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist

Adrian Balmer, Ernst and Young

Helen Thompson, Ernst and Young

Janet Day, Complaints Officer

Graham Ebers, Director of Corporate Services

Martin Jones, Financial Planning Specialist

Jonathan Ross, Senior Finance Specialist, Financial Planning & Accountancy

Andrew Moulton, Assistant Director, Governance

Jackie Whitney, Service Manager, Customer Services

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted from Councillors David Chopping and John Halsall and John Ogden, Head of Finance.

2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 8 February 2017 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

3. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest submitted.

4. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no Public questions.

5. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

There were no Member questions.

6. ANNUAL COMPLAINTS AND COMPLIMENTS 2016-17

The Committee received an update on the Council's complaints and compliments for 2016-17.

During the discussion of this item, the following points were made:

- The total number of corporate complaints had reduced since the 2015-16 financial year. Both the number of Stage 1 and Stage 2 complaints had reduced.
- Jackie Whitney, Service Manager, Customer Services informed the Committee that there had been a change in culture and that there was now a greater focus on early resolution.
- Members were informed that those who submitted complaints had the right to go to the Local Government Ombudsman.
- Councillor Bray asked how vexatious and persistent complainants were dealt with. Jackie Whitney indicated that they would be written to and advised that the Council would no longer respond about that particular matter. Any further correspondence received on the issue would be held on file.

- It was noted that 4 complaints had been 'out of scope.' Janet Day explained that these were children's services complaints that followed a statutory process. Occasionally a person submitting such a complaint was not able to do so due to the individual circumstances. For example, the child concerned might be subject of care proceedings.
- Members noted the key themes of the complaints received.
- Janet Day indicated that the number of children's services social care complaints was consistent with previous years however; the majority of complaints were resolved quickly.
- Councillor Pollock asked what the main reason was for housing complaints. Jackie Whitney stated that they generally related to repairs or dissatisfaction with contractors. Councillor Bray commented that the Tennant and Landlord Improvement Panel received information regarding housing complaints.
- Between April 2016 and March 2017 11 complaints had been escalated to the Local Government Ombudsman. Of these 11 complaints, 10 had not been upheld by the LGO. 3 were complaints which the Council had declined to investigate at Stage 2 where the LGO agreed with the Council's decision not to escalate the complaints further. 1 complaint had been partially upheld.
- In the last year 90 escalations had been received which services had been alerted to. These were where residents and customers were chasing for a response or delivery of an expected service by either calling or emailing the Council. None of these escalations had proceeded to become formal complaints.
- Members noted some examples of positive feedback that the Council had received.

RESOLVED: That the update on the Council's complaints and compliments for 2016-17 be noted.

7. WOKINGHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL'S BORROWING AND REPAYMENT EXPLAINED

Members were updated on the Council's borrowing and repayments.

During the discussion of this item, the following points were made:

- Members were updated on Capital Vision 2017/2027 Funding.
- Capital expenditure over the next three years would be £374.1million, reflecting the Council's investment ambition.
- Capital funding over the next three years would be broken down as follows: Developer contributions 31%, Borrowing 51% and Other 18%.
- For 2017/18 external borrowing was expected to increase by approximately £53million. Borrowing from markets would reduce in the short term as the Council sold residential units and as rental income was generated. Internal borrowing was anticipated to increase by approximately £24million.
- Members noted a breakdown of movement regarding the Capital Vision 2017/20 funding.
- Martin Jones outlined debt created by additional borrowing for 2017/18 to 2019/20. Invest to save included projects such as the replacement of LED streetlights in the Borough.
- With regards to capital borrowing £147,386million had been borrowed externally. £94,607million had been borrowed internally. The average interest rate had been 3.32%. If all borrowing had been undertaken externally it would have cost an additional £7.87million.

- Members were updated on Capital Programme loans to Wokingham Housing Limited (WHL). Interest was charged quarterly to WHL, currently at 5.5% plus bank rate dropping to 3.25% plus bank rate in circa 2018/19.
- Loans were to be repaid either by commuted sums given to WHL or from profit made by the company from sales of assets and rental income.
- Wokingham Housing Limited debt was backed by assets held by WHL and its subsidiaries.
- Martin Jones informed the Committee of borrowing in relation to the Capital Programme Leisure Centre Schemes. Members were reminded that leisure was not just about income provision but also the facilitation of health and wellbeing.
- Members noted the expenditure forecast for leisure for 2017-2022.
- A smaller borrowing headroom of £791,000 was anticipated.
- If the borrowing interest rate were 2.77%, the leisure debt would be repaid in 2059. If the interest rate were 3.5%, the debt would be repaid in 2067.
- The Committee was updated on Capital Programme forward funded schemes. Expenditure and funding was reviewed on a quarterly basis.
- All funding resources were allocated to maximise Council Resources.
- Forward funding borrowing and developer contributions were reconciled on a quarterly basis.

RESOLVED: That the update on the Council's borrowing and repayments be noted.

8. TREASURY MANAGEMENT OUTTURN REPORT 2016-17

The Committee received the Treasury Management Outturn report 2016-17. An amended Appendix B was circulated.

During the discussion of this item, the following points were made:

- The report illustrated the treasury management operations during 2016/17 and demonstrated that the Council had acted in accordance with its approved management practices.
- As at 31 March 2017, the Council had achieved an average return on external investments of 0.50%. If internal loans to the local authority trading companies were included, this rose to 1.66%.
- It was noted that the investment return budget had overachieved by £100,000.
- Three new loans totalling £18million had been taken out on 31 March. Martin Jones provided further information regarding the individual loans. Jonathan Ross indicated that when the loans had been taken out Officers had considered the maturity profile to ensure that the loans did not all mature at the same time.
- The Council had a capital expenditure of £72million in the General Fund, of which £44.9million was funded by borrowing. The remaining amount was funded by Capital Grants.
- The Council had repaid a HRA self-financing loan of £2.3million.
- External borrowing was at £147.4million.
- Councillor Pollock commented that it was helpful that the report included the maturity profile. Martin Jones explained the size of the principles for the HRA self-financing loans.
- Councillor Clark asked why the Council lent to other local authorities. It was explained that following the Icelandic bank situation many local authorities only lent to other local authorities. Helen Thompson commented that a number of local authorities were considering widening which organisations they could lend to.

RESOLVED: That

- 1) the Treasury Management outturn report for 2016/17 be noted;
- 2) the actual 2016/17 prudential indicators within the report be noted;
- 3) the report be recommended to Council for approval.

9. EXTERNAL AUDIT FEES 2017/18

The Committee were updated on the External Audit Fees 2017/18. The report confirmed the audit and certification work that Ernst and Young proposed to undertake for the 2017/18 financial year at the Council.

During the discussion of this item, the following points were made:

- Members were reminded that from 2018/19 onwards, local authorities would be responsible for appointing their own auditors, and directly managing the resulting contract and the relationship.
- The Council, like many other councils had opted into the Public Sector Audit Appointments (PSAA) process. The PSAA had managed the procurement process. Contracts would be awarded by 30 June 2017. Councillor Pollock requested that Members be informed of the Council's appointed auditor when this had been finalised.
- The certification of housing benefit subsidy claim indicative fee for 2017/18 was still to be confirmed.

RESOLVED: That the External Audit Fees 2017/18 be noted.

10. EXTERNAL AUDIT PROGRESS REPORT

The Committee received the External Audit Progress report.

During the discussion of this item, the following points were made:

- The purpose of the report was to provide the Committee with an overview of the stage Ernst and Young had reached in the Council's 2016/17 audit and to ensure the audit aligned with Committee expectations.
- The External Audit Plan 2016-17 had been presented to the Committee in February 2017.
- Members noted the timetable showing key stages of the audit.
- The Committee was reminded that timescales were shifting earlier in the year.
- There were no issues regarding 'Value for Money' that needed to be brought to the Committee's attention.

RESOLVED: That the External Audit Progress report be noted.

11. ERNST AND YOUNG LOCAL GOVERNMENT AUDIT COMMITTEE SECTOR BRIEFING

Members received the Ernst and Young Local Government Audit Committee Sector Briefing. It was agreed that these briefings would be circulated to the Committee in future. Members were informed that a forum for Audit Committee Chairmen was being developed. Councillor Bray referred to the proposed question for Audit Committees regarding the Council's preparedness for the introduction of Highway Network Assets, and was informed that this introduction had been delayed.

RESOLVED: That the Ernst and Young Local Government Audit Committee Sector Briefing be noted.

12. ANNUAL GOVERNANCE STATEMENT 2016-2017

The Committee received the Annual Governance Statement 2016-17.

- The Annual Governance Statement covered the following key aspects of the governance environment in place at the Council during 2016/17:
 - Establishing and monitoring the achievement of the Council's objectives;
 - Facilitation of Policy and Decision-making;
 - Financial Management;
 - Performance Management; and
 - Risk Management.
- Ten areas of improvement had been identified.
- Members were also informed that two exceptions had been identified relating to Housing Rents and Shared Building Services. The internal audit of Housing Rents had identified concerns in relation to the collection of current and former tenants' arrears, suspense account income, supporting documentation for new sheltered housing tenancies, and reporting of Housing Revenue Account balance sheet arrears and prepayment balances. Members requested an update on this at the Committee's December meeting.

RESOLVED: That the Committee approves the Annual Governance Statement on behalf of the Council, prior to it being included in the final Statement of Accounts.

13. SHARED AUDIT AND INVESTIGATION SERVICE ANNUAL REPORT 2016-17

The Committee considered the Shared Audit and Investigation Service Annual Report 2016-17.

During the discussion of this item, the following points were made:

- As at 31 March 74% of the approved Internal Audit Plan was achieved with the reviews at draft report stage or completed.
- Progress against the plan had been affected by one officer being on maternity leave for the majority of the year and one officer being seconded to the 21st Century Council Programme.
- Four areas had received the audit opinion 3: Capital Programme, Accounting, Expenditure Monitoring, Housing Rents, Contract Management (Part II) and Shared Building Services.
- The Investigations element of the Service had identified a total potential financial saving of £51,619. That had included £29,170 of actual overpayments that were potentially recoverable.
- This year the team would undergo an external assessment, the results of which would be reported to the Committee.

RESOLVED: That the Shared Audit and Investigation Service Annual Report 2016-17 be noted.

14. REVISED WOKINGHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL AUDIT AND INVESTIGATIONS PLAN 2017-18

Members received the revised Wokingham Borough Council Audit and Investigations Plan 2017-18.

During the discussion of this item, the following points were made:

- The Audit and Investigations Plans 2017-18 had been approved in February 2017. Work had since been reprioritised because of a number of factors such as the secondment of two team members, and a revised plan had been produced.
- The team were also undertaking work around their own internal efficiency.
- Traditionally the Investigations team had focused on both cashable and non-cashable work. The focus would now be more on work that was likely to have a cashable outcome.
- The team would aim to maintain external income generation.
- Councillor Pollock commented that the original total audit days was 1,272 and the revised total was 563. He questioned whether this reduction was largely the result of there being less staff. Andrew Moulton stated that it was and that also the team had looked to see where it could be more efficient overall.
- In response to a Member question regarding the selling of any surplus audit days, Andrew Moulton confirmed that this was done where possible.
- Councillor Bray asked why no audit days had been allocated to 'Risk of inability to match supply and demand for school places.' Andrew Moulton stated that this remained on the Corporate Risk Register and that the Committee would be updated on progress made against this.

RESOLVED: That the revised Wokingham Borough Council Audit and Investigations Plan 2017-18 be approved.

15. FORWARD PROGRAMME 2017-18

The Committee received the forward programme for 2017-18.

During the discussion of this item, the following points were made:

- An update on the Council's Housing Rents, in particular relating to the collection of current and former tenants' arrears, be provided at the Committee's meeting in December.
- Helen Thompson indicated that Ernst and Young would bring their 2017/18 Audit Plan to the Committee's December meeting.
- Councillor Bray commented that new data protection legislation would be coming in, in the near future. The Committee agreed that an update on the Council's preparedness for this change in legislation would be helpful.
- It was proposed that Members receive a briefing on the draft financial statements prior to the Committee's meeting in September.

RESOLVED: That the forward programme be noted.

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD ON 14 JUNE 2017 FROM 7.00 PM TO 8.55 PM**

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Tim Holton (Chairman), John Kaiser (Vice-Chairman), John Jarvis, Malcolm Richards, Angus Ross, Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey, Wayne Smith and Bill Soane

Other Councillors Present

Councillors: David Lee and Barrie Patman

Officers Present

Chris Easton, Service Manager, Highways Development Management
Mary Severin, Borough Solicitor
Justin Turvey, Operational Development Management Lead Officer
Arabella Yandle, Democratic Services Officer

Case Officers Present

Katie Herrington, Senior Planning Officer
Pooja Kumar, Senior Planning Officer
Ashley Smith, Development Management Team Manager
Graham Vaughan, Senior Planning Officer
Christopher Kempster, Career Grade Planning Officer
Daniel Ray, Senior Planning Officer

1. APOLOGIES

An apology for absence was submitted from Councillor Philip Houldsworth

2. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Councillor John Jarvis declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Item 11, Application no 171120 – Grovelands Park, Grovelands Avenue because he was a Non-Executive Director on Wokingham Housing Ltd at the time that the application was submitted. (He left the meeting during consideration of the matter and did not take part in the vote.)

Councillor Angus Ross declared a personal interest in items 5 and 10: Application no 170264 – Land at Finchampstead Road; and Application no – 171143 – Ryeish Sports Centre, stating that though he had been the Executive Member for the Environment when these applications had been submitted, he still had an open mind with regard to the decision.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 10 May 2017 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

MEMBERS' UPDATE

There are a number of references to the Members' Update within these minutes. The Members' Update was circulated to all present prior to the meeting. A copy is attached.

4. APPLICATIONS TO BE DEFERRED AND WITHDRAWN ITEMS

No applications were recommended for deferral or withdrawn

5. APPLICATION NO 170264 - LAND AT FINCHAMPSTEAD ROAD

(Councillor Angus Ross declared a personal interest in this item)

Proposal: Full application for the proposed change of use of land to Suitable Alternative natural greenspace (SANG) with associated landscape works and parking.

Applicant: Gladman Developments

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in Agenda pages 13 to 30.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- Clarification that the application stood alone and unrelated to any development;
- Confirmation that the WBC Drainage Officer was satisfied with the scheme;
- Proposed amendment to Condition 2, and
- Proposed update to plan numbers in Condition 4.

Clarissa Flynn, Residents Group, spoke against the application. With the aid of a presentation, she suggested that the proposed site for the SANG was not an ideal one. The existing path and access were narrow, there was no bus access and the site was prone to flooding. A tree survey had indicated that eight veteran oaks with Tree Protection Orders would be felled. She stated that there were many other sites that were better suited to development as SANGs and suggested that the application would not have been proposed without the intention to build houses nearby.

David Lee, Ward Member for Norreys, read a statement on behalf of Julian Mcghee-Sumner, Ward Member for Westcott, in opposition to the application. He stated that the application was premature and that it was intrinsically linked to a development.

In response, the Case Officer stated that the application before the Committee was a separate matter from any future application pertaining to development. He indicated that the SANG would use existing access so would have little impact on trees. The WBC officer was satisfied with the SANG application.

Following discussion, Councillor John Kaiser proposed that the application be deferred to allow Members to attend a site visit to gain a fuller understanding of the application. This was seconded by Councillor Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey.

Resolved: That Application no 170264 be deferred in order to allow the Committee to undertake a site visit.

6. APPLICATION NO 162885 - READING FOOTBALL CLUB AT FOREST SCHOOL

Proposal: Full planning application for indoor sports facility; means of access and parking; ancillary outbuildings and associated landscaping.

Applicant: Reading Football Club

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in Agenda pages 31 to 62.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- Clarification that Forest School was an academy;
- Clarification as to construction hours, and
- A proposed update to condition 3 listing amended plan numbers.

Nina Sharp, Consultant and Agent for Barton Wilmore, spoke in favour of the application, outlining the close working relationship between Reading Football Club and the Forest School. She stated that benefits to the proposals included improved playing field surfaces and landscaping, together with an increase in community use.

In response to a Member question regarding lighting in the dome, she explained that the dome structure reflected light into the interior only and would not therefore create any light pollution.

Resolved: That Application no 162885 be approved, subject to the conditions set out in Agenda pages 31 to 62, and the update to Condition 3 and the clarifications as laid out in the Members' Update.

7. APPLICATION NO 161911 - CROSFIELDS SCHOOL, SHINFIELD ROAD

Proposal: Full application for the proposed artificial turf pitch with fencing and floodlighting, re-grading of land for two new football pitches and an artificial cricket strip

Applicant: Crosfields School, Shinfield Road, Wokingham

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in Agenda pages 63 to 92.

Neil Boddington, Agent, spoke in favour of the application, stating that he had worked closely with the Case Officer on the application. The application included a bio-diversity condition, which the applicants are happy to implement and work with the Council on. There was no intention to develop the land in future.

Resolved: That Application no 161911 be approved subject to the conditions set out in Agenda pages 63 to 92.

8. APPLICATION NO 163372 - WOKINGHAM THEATRE, TWYFORD ROAD

Proposal: Full application for the proposed internal/external alterations to theatre to provide additional backstage space, rehearsal space, new studio, public circulation areas and new storage barn.

Applicant: Wokingham Theatre Board

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in Agenda pages 93 to 118.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- Clarification on the nature of community use provided;
- Proposed amendment to Condition 8, to wit that drainage requires 40% allowance for climate change;
- Proposed amendments to Condition 2 and 4;
- Proposed amendments to plans, and

- Proposed additional condition requiring the submission and approval of a Construction Method Statement prior to any development.

Hedda Bird spoke in favour of the application, outlining the success of the Theatre and the opportunities that expansion would offer, including higher attendance figures, clubs and training. Katie Hamilton then went on to re-iterate the wide community use by local people from eight to 80 years of age.

David Lee, Ward Member for Norreys, spoke in favour of the application, stating that since the original decision in the 1980s to build the facility, it had gone from strength to strength. He asked if there would be an extension granted if part of the expansion had not been completed prior to the end of the 3-year construction condition.

In response, the Case Officer stated that the 3-year construction condition referred to the commencement of development. She also clarified that fire prevention strategies were governed by Building Control regulations and did not come under the purview of the Planning Department.

In response to Member questions regarding the plans and parking, the Service Manager, Highways Development Management, clarified that the regulations required 1 car park space to every 5 seats and that the scheme provided in excess of this number for the additional elements of the proposal.

In response to Member questions regarding the Community Plan, the Lead Officer, Operational Development Management, stated that Ward Members would be consulted on the community use Management Plan in Condition 4.

Resolved: That Application no 163372 be approved subject to the conditions set out in Agenda pages 93-118, the amendments to conditions 2 and 8 and the additional condition and clarifications as laid out in the Members' Update, and the amendment to condition 4 as laid out in the Members' Update with an additional comment, to wit that the Community Plan be agreed in conjunction with the Ward Members.

9. APPLICATION NO 171143 - RYEISH SPORTS CENTRE *(Councillor Angus Ross declared a personal interest in this item)*

Proposal: Full application for the proposed construction of new sports changing facilities and fitness suite following demolition of the existing building on site.

Applicant: Mr Andy Glencross, Wokingham Borough Council

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in Agenda pages 143 to 168.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included clarifications as to the applicant and the number of car parking spaces provided.

Neil Jones, Senior Operational Property Specialist, spoke in favour of the application, outlining the history of the site and the range of improvements that were being offered by the application.

Barrie Patman, Ward Member for Shinfield South, spoke in favour of the application, stating that the improvements to the site and the wide range of sports and activities that were proposed would increase the footfall. He suggested that access would be improved with good signage and that the site needed to be well advertised.

In response, the Service Manager, Highways Development Management, outlined the road improvements, cycle lanes and the upgrading of footpaths that were taking place in association with wider development that was progressing as part of the South of the M4 Strategic Development Location.

Resolved: That Application no 171143 be approved, subject to the conditions set out in Agenda pages 143 to 168 and the clarifications as laid out in the Members' Update.

10. APPLICATION NO 171007 - HIGHWOOD PRIMARY SCHOOL, FAIRWATER DRIVE

Proposal: A full application for a single Storey extension for the creation of six classrooms to the north side of the existing car park and, a new Speech and Language building adjacent to the existing hall to allow for a 2 form entry school. Additional staff parking bays and Cycle Canopy provision. New pedestrian route from Woodlands Avenue and a new reception classroom garden to the north of existing nursery/reception block.

Applicant: Wokingham Borough Council

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in Agenda pages 119 to 142.

Anju Sharma, Specialist, Growth & Delivery, spoke in favour of the application, stating that, as part of the Primary Schools Strategy, Woodley had been identified as requiring an extra 45 places per year and that the application before the Committee would provide 30 of these. The site was close to new developments that would see approximately 1000 new properties built in the area. The application would provide enhanced facilities, more parking and a specialist unit for speech and language therapy.

In response to Member queries regarding parking, the Service Manager, Highways Development Management, explained that the amount of spaces provided by the proposal was in excess of those required by the Council's parking standards of one space per each Full Time Equivalent (FTE) staff member. The increase in numbers would be phased in over several years, allowing the school to work with the community and to upgrade/develop further the School Travel Plan.

In response to a Member question regarding loss of space, the Case Officer stated that most of the area that was due to be developed was already hard standing.

Resolved: That Application no 171007 be approved subject to the conditions set out in Agenda pages 119 to 142.

11. APPLICATION NO 171120 - GROVELANDS PARK, GROVELANDS AVENUE *(Councillor John Jarvis declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this item)*

Proposal: Application to vary conditions 2, 3 and 9 of planning consent F/2014/2611 for the erection of residential development of 6no two bed dwellings with associated external

works. Condition 2, 3 and 9 relate to materials, elevation and boundary treatments respectively

Applicant: Wokingham Housing Limited

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in Agenda pages 169 to 182.

Resolved: That Application no 171120 be approved, subject to the conditions set out in Agenda pages 169 to 182.

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD
HELD ON 15 JUNE 2017 FROM 5.00 PM TO 7.05 PM**

Present

Charlotte Haitham Taylor	WBC
Julian McGhee-Sumner	WBC
Beverley Graves	Business Skills and Enterprise Partnership
Judith Ramsden	Director of People Services
Katie Summers	Director of Operations, Wokingham CCG
Darrell Gale (substituting Dr Lise Llewellyn)	Consultant in Public Health
Jim Stockley (substituting Nick Campbell- White)	Healthwatch Wokingham Borough

Also Present:

Madeleine Shopland	Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist
Nicola Strudley	Healthwatch Wokingham Borough

1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

RESOLVED: That Councillor Julian McGhee Sumner be elected Chairman of the Health and Wellbeing Board for the 2017/18 municipal year.

2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIRMAN

RESOLVED: That Dr Zylstra be appointed Vice Chairman of the Health and Wellbeing Board for the 2017/18 municipal year.

3. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted from Councillor Mark Ashwell, Nick Campbell-White, Superintendent Rob France, Kevin Johnson, Dr Lise Llewellyn, Nikki Luffingham, Clare Rebeck, Kevin Ward, Dr Cathy Winfield, Judith Wright and Dr Johan Zylstra.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Board held on 6 April 2017 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

Judith Ramsden proposed that a paper be presented at a future meeting regarding energising and focusing the Health and Wellbeing Board.

5. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Councillor Haitham Taylor declared a personal interest in Item 11 Healthwatch Wokingham Borough – Extra Care as her husband worked for a telecommunications business.

6. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no public questions.

7. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

There were no Member questions.

8. HEALTH AND WELLBEING STRATEGY STRATEGIC DELIVERY PLAN

The Board received the Health and Wellbeing Strategy Strategic Delivery Plan.

During the discussion of this item, the following points were made:

- Board members were reminded that there were four main priorities that underpinned the Health and Wellbeing Strategy.
- Darrell Gale took the Board through actions under each priority including 'Promoting 'Making Every Contact Count' approach across all services, beginning with most deprived LSOAS and new SDLs.' Katie Summers commented that this needed to be implemented across all of the Berkshire West, Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire authorities. Judith Ramsden stated that points of commonality needed to be ascertained.
- A proposed action was 'Testing in one or more Neighbourhood Policing Teams a Police Officer taking role of Community Navigator.' Board members felt that this was an innovative proposal.
- With regards to the proposed action, 'Reduce percentage of those who are deemed inactive from 20.9% to 18% by 2018 in the specific areas', Katie Summers commented that a key workstream of the Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West Sustainability Transformation Plan was physical activity in the digital sphere. Nicola Strudley asked whether the Patient Portal could use data from Fitbits. Board members were informed of a pilot scheme involving fitness trackers that was under consideration. Beverley Graves informed the Board of an event that the Central Berkshire Education Business Partnership would be hosting on 20 July for Bulmershe School to encourage young people to pursue careers in Science, Technology, Engineering and Maths. It was suggested that the young people could also be another audience for the pilot.
- It was important to agree what was needed for Borough residents. The Board agreed that specific messages could be better communicated. Judith Ramsden suggested that community engagement events be planned.
- The Board considered how the action plan would be monitored. Many of the action plan actions were process oriented, reflecting the new 21st Century Council structure. A short progress report on the action plan would be presented to the Board every other meeting (October; February and June meetings). The Board would receive exceptions from each quarter's Public Health Outcomes Framework at each Board meeting and also the high-level metrics. Board members felt that the metrics needed to be worked up more so that they linked more coherently with the Health and Wellbeing Strategy.
- Actions from the Better Care Fund action plan would be incorporated into the Health and Wellbeing Strategy action plan.
- It was agreed that a glossary of terms would be produced to be included in future Health and Wellbeing Board meeting agendas. This would be useful for non-health Board members in particular.
- Katie Summers suggested that there needed to be greater PR and communication work around the Health and Wellbeing Strategy. Judith Ramsden commented that a resource could be made available to further working with the communities. It was also proposed that Healthwatch Wokingham Borough assist in the promotion of the Health and Wellbeing Strategy.

RESOLVED: That the Board approve this Action Plan to support delivery of the Health and Wellbeing Strategy, and gives full support to all involved in its delivery during the next three years.

9. WEST OF BERKSHIRE SAFEGUARDING ADULTS BOARD ANNUAL REPORT 2015-2016

This item was withdrawn from the agenda.

10. UPDATE ON COMMUNITY NAVIGATORS/ CHASC

The Health and Wellbeing Board received an update on the Community Navigators.

During the discussion of this item, the following points were made:

- The Board noted the aims and purpose of the Community Navigators.
- Katie Summers highlighted the benefits for GPs and patients.
- Navigators were currently based in the following GP practices: Wargrave, Swallowfield, Brookside, Woodley and Wokingham Medical Centre. It was planned to introduce them into other practices including Burma Hills and Woosehill.
- Board members noted the total referrals to community navigators between March 2016-March 2017 and the different referral sources.
- The budget for 2016-17 had been £47,386 and the actual spend £26,907. The underspend in 2016/17 was due to an additional navigator co-ordinator post being budgeted for the last two quarters of 2016/17. Councillor Haitham Taylor commented that only a relatively small number of people had been referred by the Community Navigators and that the cost per referral was still quite high. Katie Summers emphasised that those referred would often be higher users and that it was an invest to save opportunity. She would ask Involve to send the names of those patients who had been referred by the Community Navigators, to the Commissioning Support Unit who would be able to ascertain the number of GP contacts the individual had had over the past 2 years, to better assess the impact of the Community Navigators.
- It had been proposed that a Police Officer would also become a Community Navigator. Judith Ramsden explained that they would receive training so that they would be able to provide people with information if required. Nicola Strudley questioned whether postmen could also be encouraged to be Community Navigators. It was suggested that this be discussed at WISP.
- Katie Summers commented that Involve had found it difficult to find volunteers.
- Beverley Graves suggested that the MICe bus (Mobile Information Centre) and Earley Crescent Resource Centre were possible referral sources.
- Board members requested an update on Community, Health and Social Care at the Board's next meeting.

RESOLVED: That the update on the Community Navigators be noted.

11. HEALTHWATCH WOKINGHAM BOROUGH - EXTRA CARE

Nicola Strudley circulated Healthwatch Wokingham Borough's Annual Report and presented the report produced about Extra Care.

During the discussion of this item, the following points were made:

- The Council's Housing Strategy for Older People had indicated that extra care would be a focus going forwards.
- Two new extra care schemes were due to open in the Borough.
- Healthwatch Wokingham Borough, with the help of volunteer drivers, had undertaken a poll about whether people had given consideration as to where they

would live if they were no longer able to live in their own homes. 95% of those who responded said that they had not.

- Extra care meant different things to different people. Healthwatch had produced a fact sheet to assist people.
- A Healthwatch Wokingham Borough project team had visited the three existing extra care facilities within the Borough and had talked to residents and staff.
- A number of common themes had emerged. Nicola Strudley highlighted specific examples where residents had had issues with building design. One resident had been scared to use their shower because the grab rails had suction cups and they were unconvinced of their safety. Another resident had an issue with bright sunlight streaming into their room during the middle of the day, making it necessary to move rooms.
- Although there were communal areas, they were not necessarily well used and more could be done to encourage this.
- Another theme which had emerged was managing residents' and their families' expectations.
- The report had been sent to the interim commissioner with responsibility for extra care.
- A seminar would be held early in the new year to review progress made against the report.
- Katie Summers commented that the report fitted in with the new work of the Better Care Fund.
- Councillor Haitham Taylor commented that new providers coming into the Borough might have different views on provision. She suggested that Healthwatch Wokingham Borough engage with other providers at an early stage, where possible. It was appreciated that extra care facilities could have several different providers so this could sometimes be complex.
- Judith Ramsden stated that the Council needed to champion what good looked like.
- Beverley Graves asked if support was available for residents who needed help to take medication but could still live at home. It was noted that care calls to help with medication could be arranged and that people could also buy into telephone systems which could act as reminders.

RESOLVED: That the Healthwatch Wokingham Borough's report regarding Extra Care be noted.

12. COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP STRATEGY

This item was deferred to the Board's next meeting in August.

13. INDEPENDENT ANNUAL REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH

The Board received the Independent Annual Report of the Director of Public Health.

During the discussion of this item, the following points were made:

- The Director of Public Health was required to produce an annual report on the health of the local population.
- The report outlined preventable and avoidable deaths in the Wokingham Borough population and the causes of these including smoking; high blood pressure; alcohol; physical inactivity and obesity. It also outlined these issues, the local impact, and evidence based interventions to reduce the harms.
- Darrell Gale explained the difference between preventable and amenable mortality.

- It was noted that across all preventable deaths there was a correlation between the levels of deprivation when the wards were grouped by levels of affluence. In addition, the most deprived groups of people were more likely to engage in multiple risk areas e.g. smoking and drinking alcohol.
- With regards to smoking, the local smoking cessation services targeted those groups with a higher prevalence e.g. routine and manual workers. E-cigarettes were discussed.
- Around 34,200 of the Wokingham CCG population were thought to have high blood pressure and of those only 19,700 were being treated for this. A 20% improvement in blood pressure control could represent a cost saving within 5 years.
- Board members were informed that locally there was a smaller take up of NHS Health Checks than there was nationally.
- The Board discussed the impact of alcohol. In response to a question, Darrell Gale commented that in the Borough, middle aged, middle class working men and women were at risk of alcohol related issues. However, further information would be required to gain a clearer picture of the situation.
- Nicola Strudley asked about support from the business community for those with alcohol issues.
- Katie Summers commented that not all members of the public may be aware of what the safe alcohol limit guidelines were.
- Judith Ramsden proposed that a communication strategy be developed and that the Board agree when during the year particular messages should be amplified.
- Board members were informed that physical inactivity was the cause of 9% of premature mortality.
- Obesity in the Borough, particularly amongst children and young people, was discussed.
- The Health and Wellbeing Strategy would pick up many of the issues identified.

RESOLVED: That the content of the Independent Annual Report of the Director of Public Health be noted.

14. PHARMACEUTICAL NEEDS ASSESSMENT DELIVERY PLAN

The Board noted the Pharmaceutical Needs Assessment Delivery Plan, which outlined the plans being put in place to deliver the new Pharmaceutical Needs Assessment 2018-2021 for the Wokingham Borough.

RESOLVED: That the content of the report be noted and that constituent organisations work with the Public Health Team at Wokingham Borough Council to facilitate the public consultation required to complete the assessment.

15. UPDATES FROM BOARD MEMBERS

The Board noted an update on the work of the Business, Skills and Enterprise Partnership.

RESOLVED: That the update from the Business, Skills and Enterprise Partnership be noted.

16. FORWARD PROGRAMME

The Board discussed the forward programme for the remainder of the municipal year.

During the discussion of the item, the following points were made:

- Board members requested that a glossary of terms be produced to be included in future agendas.
- A further update on Community Health & Social Care (CHASC) be provided at the Board's August meeting.
- It was proposed that Board meetings begin earlier if the agenda was particularly heavy.
- Darrell Gale commented that it was important to get the message out about the danger of children falling out of windows, particularly with a heatwave impending.

RESOLVED: That the forward programme be noted.

17. WOKINGHAM INTEGRATION STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Board received the Wokingham Integration Strategic Partnership Terms of Reference.

RESOLVED: That the Wokingham Integration Strategic Partnership Terms of Reference be approved.

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
COMMUNITY AND CORPORATE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
HELD ON 19 JUNE 2017 FROM 7.00 PM TO 9.20 PM**

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Shahid Younis (Chairman), Bill Soane (Vice-Chairman), Pauline Jorgensen, Abdul Loyes, Ken Miall, Philip Mirfin, David Sleight and Ian Pittock

Other Councillors Present

Councillors: Dianne King, Chris Bowring, Michael Firmager and Norman Jorgensen

Officers Present

Arabella Yandle (Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist), Paul Feven (Assistant Director of People Commissioning (Interim)), Matt Gould (Service Manager, Transport & Road Safety) and Edward Napper (Drainage Maintenance Manager)

1. APOLOGIES

An apology for absence was submitted from Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey.

2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 13 March 2017 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

3. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

A declaration of personal interest in item 9 was submitted from Councillor David Sleight on the basis that he was a Member of the Parking Working Group.

4. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no public questions.

5. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

There were no Member questions.

6. PRINCIPLES OF OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY

Arabella Yandle, Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist presented a paper on the principles of overview and scrutiny. The paper outlined the benefits to the community of a rigorous approach to overview and scrutiny, citing good and bad examples and suggesting a range of stakeholders to approach for input. It was designed to stimulate a conversation about checks and balances, a topic that was particularly pertinent in the week following the fire at Grenfell Tower.

During the discussion of the item, the following points were made:

- The quality of scrutiny depended on the timeliness and quality of information provided;
- Members needed time to digest the contents of reports so reports should be published with the agenda. Verbal reports alone would not be accepted. Items that did not include reports should not be discussed;
- Ideally, items should come to overview and scrutiny committees prior to being adopted/finalised so that the committees could inform the process;

- Different approaches to increasing the contribution of a range of stakeholders should be considered, including the potential of holding themed evenings and inviting key stakeholders to contribute;
- It would be valuable to gain knowledge of overview and scrutiny by attending overview and scrutiny meetings in other boroughs. The value of this could then be fed back to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee;
- Holding Chairman's Briefings to look at draft reports prior to the publication of the agenda allowed the opportunity to make sure the reports were fit for purpose, and
- To increase the involvement of all the Members of the Committee, Members would be invited to submit questions and issues to the Chair two weeks after a meeting. These would be passed to the officers to ensure their inclusion in the reports.

Resolved: That

1. Neil Carr, Scrutiny Officer, investigate and advise on good practice in overview and scrutiny meetings in other boroughs that Members could attend prior to the next Community and Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Meeting;
2. A recommendation be submitted to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee relating to late items and, if approved, be submitted to the Constitutional Working Group for consideration, and
3. Members of the Committee consider items in the Forward Plan and submit any questions or issues to the Chair within two weeks of the meeting for inclusion in reports.

7. REVIEW OF THE VOLUNTARY SECTOR

Arabella Yandle, Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist, delivered a brief summary of the history of the Committee's interest in the voluntary sector and outside bodies.

Paul Feven, Assistant Director of People Commissioning, then presented the report, outlining the intention behind the Strategic Review of voluntary sector services and the work that had been carried out on it to date. The focus was to ascertain which services were being provided; how they were being delivered and determine the means by which they would be evaluated in future (i.e. clear required outcomes for service users). On the whole this would also involve moving from short term grant funding to longer term contracts, providing more security for providers. The review will also improve the service to the residents by attaching KPIs to the services they were provided with whilst assisting the voluntary sector in their medium to long term planning. He explained that the report had gone to Executive in January and that it was a work in progress.

In response to Member questions, it was clarified what was meant by outside bodies and the voluntary sector, explaining that the two overlapped in that some of the outside bodies that the Council had representation on were also providers. The work that was covered by the report related to any organisation that provided a service that had been commissioned by the People Directorate, commissioning being the assessment of a need and how to meet it. This is as opposed to procurement, which is the process of purchasing.

The Assistant Director of People Commissioning went on to explain how the new process would be streamlined to remove areas of service duplication. Providers would only be asked to provide necessary information that added value to the review process.

During the discussion of the item, the following points were made:

- Ward Members were frequently asked questions by residents that they could not answer as they were not kept up to speed with changes;
- A process should be put in place to advise and assist charities whose funding was not going to continue;
- Users of services and service providers should be invited to take part in overview and scrutiny as part of ensuring quality provision and rigorous overview and scrutiny;
- In the pursuit of transparency, details of grants, funding and other payments received by outside bodies and the voluntary sector should be posted on the internet, and
- The Review needed to be expanded to include Place.

Resolved: That

1. For the Assistant Director for Place Commissioning to deliver an update on the Review at the Community and Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Meeting on 4 September 2017;
2. The invitation be extended to the Assistant Director of Place Commissioning so that she might report on how the review could be extended to the Place Directorate;
3. The Directorates open and maintain communication pathways with Ward Members to keep them informed about items that affect their wards, and
4. Officers investigate the feasibility of posting a page on the internet listing organisations and the funding they receive.

8. FLOOD RISK UPDATE

Eddie Napper, Drainage Maintenance Manager, delivered an update on Flood Risk in the Borough on behalf of Francesca Hobson, Flood Risk Manager, outlining the progress made with the Lead Local Flood Authority's duties during 2016-17.

In response to Member questions, he outlined the process needed to assess an asset and enter it on to the asset register, which would be accessible on line for both staff and residents. In relation to Land Drainage Byelaws, he stated that there were powers to force a landowner to maintain a Land Drain and that these would be enhanced under Wokingham specific byelaws that included, among other things, a restriction on building within 8m of the top of a bank, a rule that would be upheld under Planning regulations.

He went on to state that a new company had been awarded the contract for Gully Cleansing and outlined how the company worked with technology to provide up to date and accurate data that would be readily accessible when dealing with a resident query.

In response to a Member question regarding Flood Wardens, he explained the value of local knowledge of residents in reporting river and stream levels. Ward Members and Parishes would be informed who they were and the areas they covered.

Resolved: That

1. Ward Members and Parish Councils be informed as to who the Flood Wardens were and which areas they covered, and

2. The Flood Risk Manager review the online content of the asset register and inform the Committee as to when it will become available.

9. CAR PARK PRICING

(Councillor David Sleight declared a personal interest)

Matthew Gould, Service Manager, Transport & Road Safety, delivered an update from the Parking Working Group, outlining the benefit to residents of the changes in the Council's parking strategy.

In response to Member questions regarding school drop offs, the Service Manager, Transport & Road Safety, confirmed that the item on school gate parking would include 'kiss and go' drop offs. He stated that the issue of school dropping off points and additional parking would be considered as part of the new strategy.

In regards to the road restrictions on Peach Street (that had recently come to an end) and other concerns around illegal parking, he suggested that the adoption of Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE), which was due to come on board in the near future, would allow the Council to pursue illegal parking aggressively and that a lot of the existing issues would be resolved disappear. He also stated that CPE would help to address some of the issues regarding lorries and other vehicles blocking roads where they are contravening parking restrictions.

Resolved: That the report be noted.

10. WORK PROGRAMME

The Work Programme for September was reviewed and the following points were made:

- As per the resolutions in item 6, Members of the Committee should submit any questions or issues around the items on the agenda in September to the Chair by week commencing 3 July 2017 for referral to officers for inclusion in their reports;
- As per the resolutions in item 7, the two Heads of Strategic Commissioning be invited to attend the September meeting to deliver updates on the review of voluntary sector;
- The item on Wokingham Town Centre Regeneration be postponed to November;
- Alex Deans be asked to include issues on the work on the A329M in his update, and
- David Wilby be asked to include how the work on the Reading Road is being managed in his update on cycling lanes.

The Work Programme for November was reviewed and the following points were made:

The item on the 21st Century Council should be postponed until January 2018 at the earliest, but the Committee felt that, as such an important issue, it was important that all aspects of overview and scrutiny be given enough time to examine its impact. If it was to be merged into one meeting with the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee, the Members of all other overview and scrutiny committees should be invited to attend.

Resolved: That the Work Programme be noted and the changes outlined above be actioned.

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
CHILDREN'S SERVICES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
HELD ON 20 JUNE 2017 FROM 7.10 PM TO 9.07 PM**

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Pauline Helliar-Symons (Chairman), Parry Batth, Kate Haines, Ken Miall and Beth Rowland

Other Councillors Present

Councillors: Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey, Mark Ashwell, Prue Bray, Gary Cowan, John Kaiser, David Lee, Philip Mirfin, Ian Pittock, Malcolm Richards and Imogen Shepherd-DuBey

Officers Present

Luciane Bowker, Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist
Lisa Humphreys, Head of Social Care and Intervention
Judith Ramsden, Director of People Services
Jane Winterbone, Interim Head of Learning and Achievement

1. NEW ROOM BOOKING SYSTEM

The Chairman wished to record a formal complaint about the fact that as a result of the new room booking system, the screen in reception no longer displayed the meeting rooms. This new system had been causing delays and difficulties for members of the public and elected Members when trying to find their way to meetings. It was suggested that this issue should be looked at by Officers to find a satisfactory solution to the problem.

It was noted that it had not been an Officer decision to change the location of this meeting from LGF4 to the Council Chamber.

2. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted from Paul Feven and Councillors Laura Blumenthal and Shahid Younis.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 21 March 2017 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

Matters arising

Judith Ramsden, Director of People Services agreed to circulate a list of governors' vacancies to all elected Members.

Judith Ramsden offered to showcase MOSAIC to Councillors Blumenthal and Younis if they were still interested. Luciane Bowker, Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist would contact the Councillors regarding this.

4. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Councillor Rowland declared a personal interest in Agenda item 12, *School Improvement and Educational Standards: Schools Causing Concern*, on the basis that she was a governor at Highwood Primary and South Lake Primary.

It was understood and expected that all Councillors would have a personal interest in the schools within their local wards.

5. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no public questions.

6. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

There were no Member questions.

7. CHILDREN'S SERVICES PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

The Committee considered the Children's Service's Performance Indicators report which was set out in agenda pages 13-26.

The Committee noted that there had not been any significant changes since the last report.

Councillor Miall commented that it was useful to know that the red indicator *% Children who became subject of a Child Protection Plan (CPP) who are subject to a CPP for a second or subsequent time within 24 months*, related to three children from one family and one child from another family. Although statistically there were four children, there were only two families involved.

The Chairman noted that the indicator relating to *% Secondary Schools with a current Ofsted rating of "good" or better* was still amber. However, the Chairman recognised that it was more difficult to achieve a "good" rating under the new Ofsted regime.

RESOLVED That the Children Services Performance Indicators report be noted.

8. SCHOOL PERFORMANCE AND OFSTED REPORTS

The Committee considered the School Performance and Ofsted reports which were set out in agenda pages 27- 48. The Chairman asked that a list containing the Ofsted ratings of all the schools in the Borough be included in future reports. Jane Winterbone, Interim Head of Learning and Achievement agreed to include this information going forward.

During the discussion of the item the following comments were made in relation to the schools that were recently Ofsted inspected:

Hatch Ride Primary

- Members were pleased to note the positive comments that were made in the report in relation to leadership and governors.

St Crispins Secondary

- St Crispins had undergone its first Ofsted inspection under the new current Headteacher and continued to be rated 'Good'. Jane Winterbone stated that she had had a meeting with Ginny Rhodes, St Crispins Headteacher in the previous week and had visited the new Special Educational Needs (SEN) provision within the school. Jane stated that the school was striving to achieve an outstanding rating, and for this to happen it was necessary to reduce the school variance between pupils.
- Jane had had a dialogue about St Crispins' plans to convert to an academy and had been assured that the school would continue to work with the Local Authority;
- The Chairman made reference to the comments made in the Ofsted report about the History and Science departments and asked Jane what plans were being put in place to improve those departments. Jane stated she encouraged the sharing of good

practice from other departments, but she would have to go back to St Crispins for a more detailed answer to this question.

Emmbrook Secondary

- Jane stated that one of the priorities identified was to reduce the variation in the progress made between pupils in receipt of Pupil Premium Grant and their peers;
- The Chairman noted that the report contained in the agenda pack was not the “full” report and asked that in the future an executive summary be submitted to the Committee;
- Jane offered to send more information regarding Emmbrook’s Ofsted report findings, including the priorities identified;
- Judith suggested the inclusion of a web link to the full reports so that Members could read in their own time.

Hawthorns Primary

- The school continues to be good.

Councillor Rowland noted that maintaining a ‘Good’ Ofsted rating was a really good achievement as the current Ofsted standards were much more rigorous than previously.

The Chairman suggested that Councillor Ashwell, Executive Member for Children’s Services undertake the task of writing a letter of congratulations to schools that achieve a ‘Good’ or ‘Outstanding’ rating by Ofsted. Judith Ramsden confirmed that such letters were already sent to schools by her, but she would be happy for Councillor Ashwell to write the letters going forward.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) the report be noted and
- 2) future reports would contain a list of all schools in the Borough and their last Ofsted inspection ratings.

9. CHILD CARE SUFFICIENCY 2017

The Committee received the Child Care Sufficiency 2017 report which was set out in agenda pages 49-90.

The Chairman stated that the Committee had requested this report in order to assess the sufficiency of childcare in the Borough in order to deliver the additional 15 hours of childcare that parents will be entitled to from September 2017. Members had been concerned that providers may not be able to afford to deliver the extra hours.

The Chairman expressed her appreciation of the thoroughness of the report and wished to thank all the Officers involved in its production.

Councillor Rowland raised concerns that the situation was not as good as set out in the report. She stated that the school where she was a governor at had not received further information about this strategy.

Judith Ramsden explained that this was a draft strategy which was still to be submitted to the Executive, and it was important to understand the wider context of the situation. It was very complex for the Local Authority to set a strategy because childcare services were based on market forces, and the Local Authority was not the provider. The commissioner had tried to find out: how many parents would be taking the offer of extra hours; what their

work patterns were and how it would change as a result of the additional hours; how many parents from Wokingham worked outside of the Borough and were using out of the Borough childcare.

Judith stated that none of the providers had indicated that they would not be able to respond to the increased hours. The commissioner would continue to work with childcare leaders to understand the context.

Judith informed that the Early Years team was undertaking a lot of work to ensure that money would follow disadvantaged children to their respective settings, making sure that they receive what they are entitled to.

In response to a question Judith explained that some primary schools were not able to expand due to buildings constraints.

Judith stated that another issue providers were currently discussing, was about potentially having to charge more to parents that can afford to pay more to subsidise the children that do not attract enough funding for their places.

Judith confirmed that a survey had taken place earlier in the year, and this strategy was being proposed as a result of that survey. However, the commissioner would continue to evaluate the market, the level of need and how the providers are responding.

In response to a question Judith stated that the Local Authority had a duty to secure sufficient childcare under the current legislation, but it was not clear what were the consequences of not meeting the demand for places.

Judith informed that in other parts of the country parents had set up charitable provisions to serve their local communities. She emphasized that it was a market led provision.

Councillor Miall asked when and how the money would be paid to providers. Judith agreed to report back with this information.

The Chairman asked for an update in relation to the reported fallen number of Childminders in the Borough to be included with the next report to the Committee.

Councillor Rowland drew attention to the table on page 65 of the agenda and the fact that Wokingham was more than half way down the list which showed the percentage of pupils in good or outstanding primary schools across the South East region.

Members noted from the survey that most parents expressed a wish for more childcare options outside of 9am to 5pm and more childcare in the holidays. Judith stated that this information would be shared with providers and hopefully this would help to shape the strategy.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) the Children's Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee note the report and asked to be kept informed on the development of the strategy, with update reports to the November 2017 and January 2018 meetings;
- 2) the Children's Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee recognises that Wokingham Borough Council is accountable for market forces beyond its control;

3) all the Officers involved in the production of the report be thanked for their work.

10. PEER REVIEW REPORT

The Committee considered the Peer Review report which was set out in agenda pages 91-94. Lisa Humphreys, Head of Social Care and Intervention stated that the peer review had taken place in the first week of March 2017 and that the report contained a summary of its findings, including lists of strengths and recommendations. Lisa informed that a joint action plan had been produced following the review. The Chairman asked that this action plan be submitted to the September meeting of the Committee.

In response to a question Lisa stated that she believed the peer review had been a valuable exercise, and the result was a fair assessment.

Members expressed concern over the long waiting times for Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS). Judith concurred that this had been identified as a priority and other boards had also identified this issue. Judith stated that there had already been some improvement in this area.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) the report be noted and
- 2) the action plan will be submitted to the next meeting of the Committee in September 2017.

11. CHILDREN'S SERVICES O&S COMMITTEE FORWARD PROGRAMME

The Committee considered its Forward Programme for the 2017/18 municipal year.

It was agreed that the Committee would add update reports on the Childcare Sufficiency Strategy to the meetings in November 2017 and January 2018.

The Chairman stated that she would be meeting with Councillor Ashwell, Executive Member for Children's Services and Councillor Blumenthal, Vice-Chairman to the Committee to discuss the Committee's Forward Plan.

RESOLVED That the Forward Plan be noted.

12. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

RESOLVED That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of the Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act as appropriate.

13. SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT AND EDUCATIONAL STANDARDS: SCHOOL CAUSING CONCERN

The Chairman explained that '*schools causing concern*' was now a standing item of the Children's Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee. This was the result of a recommendation of the Coombes School Task and Finish Group and was intended as a mechanism to inform local ward Members at an early stage of any schools within their wards that were in danger of falling standards.

This item was considered and discussed in a Part 2 session.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) the contents of the report be noted;
- 2) a glossary of acronyms would be included with future reports.

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF
THE EXECUTIVE
HELD ON 29 JUNE 2017 FROM 7.30 PM TO 8.25 PM**

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Charlotte Haitham Taylor (Chairman), David Lee, Mark Ashwell, Chris Bowring, Norman Jorgensen, Julian McGhee-Sumner, Stuart Munro, Simon Weeks and Oliver Whittle

Other Councillors Present

Prue Bray
Gary Cowan
Lindsay Ferris
Michael Firmager
Pauline Jorgensen
Malcolm Richards
Beth Rowland
Imogen Shepherd-DuBey
Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey

14. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence received.

15. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 25 May 2017 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

16. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Councillor Norman Jorgensen declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 18 Shareholders' Report by virtue of the fact that he was a paid Non-Executive Director of WBC Holdings Ltd for part of the period reported and his wife was now a paid Non-Executive Director of WBC Holdings Ltd. Councillor Jorgensen remained in the meeting during discussions and voted on the matter.

Councillor Simon Weeks declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 18 Shareholders' Report by virtue of the fact that he was a paid Non-Executive Director of the Optalis Group for part of the period reported. Councillor Weeks remained in the meeting during discussions and voted on the matter.

Councillors David Lee and Stuart Munro declared personal interests in Agenda Item 18 Shareholders' Report by virtue of the fact that they were paid Non-Executive Directors of WBC Holdings Ltd. Councillor Lee and Munro remained in the meeting during discussions and voted on the matter.

17. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

In accordance with the agreed procedure the Chairman invited members of the public to submit questions to the appropriate Members.

There were no public questions submitted.

18. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

In accordance with the agreed procedure the Chairman invited Members to submit questions to the appropriate Members

18.1 Charles Margetts had asked the Executive Member for Planning and Enforcement the following question but as he was unable to attend the meeting the following written answer was provided:

Question

The Executive Member will be aware of various planning applications across the Borough from speculative developers. In some cases the applications relate to sites outside the settlement boundary, with limited public transport links, a limited level of local services and which are accessed via roads which are heavily congested at rush hour. Can the Executive Member clarify the general criteria which WBC looks at when considering new housing development?

Answer

The planning system is plan-led and we must determine applications in accordance with the development plan (Core Strategy and Managing Development Delivery Development Plan Document), unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Our Development Plan defends the Borough from inappropriate development; however, where we are thought to have less than a 5 year housing land supply a presumption in favour of development is given weight by Planning Inspectors. Up until this year our housing land supply has been underpinned by the Core Strategy 2006. Developers have however not built houses quickly and the Government has re-written how housing land supply is formulated. We have come under attack by speculative developers arguing that our housing need (856pa) should be increased, based on affordability and that our supply estimates should be reduced based on delivery constraints. Further pressure is also coming from:

- Appeal decisions (Stanbury House 862/890pa), (Park Lane 894pa);
- Current appeals at Barkham Road 950pa argued;
- the University of Reading's LPU submissions, estimated 1120pa; and
- the Housing White Paper standard formula for assessing housing need.

Going forward, our housing need figure is likely to continue to be viewed as a starting point unless the Local Plan Update adopts a fresh and robustly tested housing need number. It is clear that Inspectors are siding with the appellant in any '*on balance*' cases as this approach has already been successful. Our best defence in the longer term is to adopt the Local Plan Update and in the interim to aim at more planning consents to give us a 6 year housing land supply making it more risky for developers to appeal. It is planned to consider actions to address these concerns at the Executive meeting this evening.

18.2 Gary Cowan asked the Executive Member for Strategic Highways and Planning the following question:

Question

With the Leadership change within the Conservative Administration which sees you now as the Executive Member responsible for Strategic Highways and Planning can you advise me if the existing various housing policies adopted by this Administration will have the continued support of the Administration.

I refer in particular to the following;

- The increase of the Core Strategy approved housing numbers from 661 to 856 without any public consultation to which Officers now say this is a minimum;
- The secret plan to build up to 15,000 houses at Grazeley; and
- finally continue to support the plan announced recently in Wokingham Town Hall to support Bracknell, Reading and West Berks should they have any housing shortfalls up to 2036.

Answer

As I am sure you are aware we are required to use the most up to date housing assessment figures, and this has been confirmed by Government in various guidance, and that is the most recent and also the most recent planning appeals. GL Hearne carried out a revised housing needs assessment in October 2015 and we are now compelled to use that as the most up to date information that we have. As this is an objectively assessed piece of evidence the public consultation was not required and it is not something that we could have achieved anything by carrying out any public consultation on it.

We are forced, as I am sure you know, to accept these figures. We will challenge them but we are being constantly challenged at appeal and they keep pushing those figures up and those appeal inspectors are backing those people and still doing it. But we are not sitting back doing nothing we are challenging this.

Supplementary Question

One of the concerns I do have is although I see leadership changes within the Administration two of the key architects of the above disastrous housing policies which I have listed in my original question, supported by the Conservative Group, one has to worry about the future for Wokingham's green fields.

If you look at Windsor and Maidenhead it has 53 Conservatives out of 57 Councillors yet they are in the same drive like us in support of the Hearne report housing numbers which has actually fractured that Council and its residents.

My supplementary question is how can our residents have any confidence at all in a Conservative Administration which is positively supportive of massive housing building on an epic and unimaginable scale that will lead to concreting over vast tracts of our green fields.

Supplementary Answer

If I actually go back you had two other points in your original question so let me come back to that. The first one was the secret plan to build up to 15,000 houses at Grazeley. Grazeley was thought to have potential to be considered as a joint venture with neighbouring authorities to accommodate some of the housing requirement the Government is forcing us to accept; and that is Governments of all colours – Labour Government, coalition government of Conservative and Liberal and the Conservative Government. They are all forcing us to accept housing. This site is not totally in the Borough and it is not designed that we are taking anybody else's housing; which I think the third part of your question comes on to. It was as many other projects considered in a confidential environment to understand if it could be of benefit in alleviating some of our housing pressures; exactly what you were saying about building on greenfield sites. I

totally agree with you on that and it is certainly not my objective. It is now a formally submitted site and is being assessed alongside the other some 200 sites.

Finally you talked about something announced and I am totally ignorant of this in Wokingham Town Hall to support Bracknell, Reading and West Berkshire should they have any shortfalls. This Authority has over many years complied with Government requirements to assess our housing need and accommodate such need within our boundaries. While we have a responsibility under law to work together with our neighbours as part of the duty to co-operate, it is not our intention to take on any further un-necessary housing in our Borough; especially as we are the highest within our housing area, which is the west of Berkshire. We have the highest number of houses that has been pushed on us at 856 which is 221 more than Bracknell which is just down the road.

I will not sit by and see this area concreted over and I know Gary that you will make sure that none of us do that but you have my assurance because we will be writing to Government and we are arranging meetings with them. This Authority has granted some 10,000 planning applications and the appeals that we fail on are because the Inspectors challenge the affordability. Affordability, as everybody knows, is all to do with delivery. If you have more houses being delivered the houses are cheaper. Well, 10,000 planning applications out there you have to ask yourself, and I hope the press pick this up, who is it who is holding back on the delivery. It is not Wokingham Borough Council it is the developers and if they actually built what they say they would build you would have cheaper houses in this area. However we are constantly losing at appeal and the Government have got to change their attitude and we are going to make sure that they are aware of our frustrations.

18.3 Pauline Jorgensen asked the Executive Member for Planning and Enforcement the following question:

Question

What is the Executive Member doing to hold the developers to account for the appalling landscaping and completion of the Sibly Hall development in Earley?

Answer

It is true that the Council has struggled to get the developer Persimmon to honour its s106 legal obligations in a timely fashion at the Sibly Hall development and anecdotally we understand that we are not alone in having this problem.

WBC Officers and Earley Town Council have met on site with representatives of Persimmon on at least three occasions in the last couple of years and I have been in regular contact with senior management at Persimmon with a view to persuading them towards a satisfactory conclusion. On each occasion Persimmon have agreed but then failed to fully implement a programme of outstanding agreed works. The current estimated date for completion of all works is at the end of June 2017 and should Persimmon again miss this deadline then the Council will have no option but to pursue a legal remedy.

Supplementary Question

That is good news on behalf of the residents particularly. This has now been going on for two years I think. It is completely unsatisfactory both for the residents who have moved into really nice new houses and found that the landscaping work has not been completed and also for the residents in the area that lived there before who have found that the roads are still not repaired and the whole thing is looking an eyesore.

I went round this morning and took some more pictures which I would be happy to show you which show that the promised reseeding and weed killing does not seem to be very effective. I got John Redwood involved in November last year to help and he wrote to Persimmon and at that point they were promising that everything would be resolved shortly. I have got the letter and I would be happy to give you a copy.

I would be very keen to see this fixed and I am very pleased to hear your reassurances. I actually talked to the Town Council this morning and they have still got a list that requires doing and they don't sound to me like the sort of things that will be done by tomorrow but we can remain hopeful.

Supplementary Answer

It is disappointing that one or two national developers appear to have such disregard for agreed planning conditions often to the detriment as you say not just of the existing residents in the area but also to the purchasers of the new housing. So as indicated in my initial answer we will be pursuing an appropriate legal remedy.

18.4 Lindsay Ferris asked the Executive Member for Environment the following question:

Question

In response to the terrible fire in North Kensington, has anyone in WBC clarified the status of all fire related issues in WBC owned buildings including working Fire/Smoke Alarms and Sprinkler Systems installed or retro fitted wherever recommended and whether the same cladding has been used on any building in the Borough as in Grenfell Tower.

Answer

First, I would like to give my condolences to the families of those killed and best wishes to those affected by the fire. Clearly it was quite a tragedy.

To answer your specific question, yes we have been reviewing the fire safety status of our buildings.

For the corporate portfolio which includes education, I can confirm the following.

- Buildings where we have a duty to provide a Fire Risk Assessment in accordance with the Regulatory Order are fully compliant;
- All the maintained Schools have been resurveyed this year and are being assessed for any works that are required;
- All corporate buildings were Fire Risk Assessed last year and of the three sites identified as moderate risk we have completed the necessary works to lower them to tolerable levels i.e. low risk;
- As part of the Council's policy all new educational properties that have been completed since 2012 have installed sprinklers. These include Waingels, Bulmershe, St Crispins, Charvil Primary, Wheatfield Primary, Windmill Primary and the new Arborfield School;
- Our buildings are not high rise and there are none over five storeys.

Moving on to cladding:

- Two new buildings have been constructed recently with cladding, Shinfield Infants hall and the new Bulmershe admin block. Both sites have used Marley Equitone

- Natura cement fibreboard rain screen cladding and they are only single storey in height. This product has a class 0 flame spread certification and is not insulating;
- Windmill and Wheatfield Primary Schools which are both academies are clad with Dura cladding plastic composite decorative planks with a fire rating to Euro Class Dfl-S1. Both are single storey and have multiple escape routes and sprinkler protection. This cladding meets building regulation, has been assessed, and Officers are not recommending any further action or testing of the cladding.

Looking at properties under construction by our Housing Companies next:

- There are two schemes under construction for Loddon Homes – Fosters Extra Care scheme and 52 Reading Road. These both include a sprinkler system within the designs and as part of the build specification due to the more vulnerable nature of the future tenants of both schemes;
- The apartment blocks at Phoenix Avenue under construction for Berry Brook Homes are of traditional brick construction with no sprinkler system. They will meet all fire safety requirements and will have to satisfy Fire Safety Officer checks and assessments prior to them being let.

In relation to the Town Centre Regeneration:

- No properties will be higher than five storeys;
- All our properties have been designed and will be built in compliance with Building Regulations and the relevant Fire Regulations;
- Up to date Fire Risk Assessments are in place where they are required.

The shocking tragedy of the Grenfell Tower fire provides an important reminder to us all that we cannot be complacent with regard to the security and safety of our buildings and accommodation. Although our records show we are diligent in fire risk assessments and that we are a relatively low risk in terms of the nature of our buildings, we must continue our efforts to keep our residents safe.

This is a summary of a response there is a more detailed response available if you wish.

Supplementary Question

It might be in the full detailed response but could you just clarify that when you said the Fire Risk Assessment in the early part of your answer was that recent or was that last year? I just wanted to check that because my concern there is that the fire assessments were done in lots of places around the country and it has been found not to be quite right. So if you are saying that it was something that was done in 2014, 15 or 16 then I am looking for anything that we have done in the last few weeks.

In addition to the cladding serious concerns have been raised about the thermal insulation used. The most common thermal insulation used is Polyisocyanurate; known as PIR. This unfortunately has now been found to have problems both as a fire hazard and as a source of toxic products; in particular hydrogen cyanide. Has Wokingham Borough Council ascertained whether there are any buildings in Wokingham Borough which have used PIR?

Supplementary Answer

I will check more thoroughly on that just to give you a 100% assurance on that. My understanding is that from the checks that we have undertaken so far we haven't identified any buildings but I will get back to you with a full response on that.

18.5 Prue Bray asked the Executive Member for Environment the following question:

Question

Last year, the introduction of the new grass-cutting contract led to a large number of complaints and a lot of time and effort was expended by Councillors, residents and Officers sorting them out. Could the Executive Member please explain why the same problems are recurring with respect to some of the same areas of grass this year?

Answer

It is certainly true that we had problems during the early months of the Grounds Maintenance Contract in 2016 and these were explained at the time last year. However, last year those problems were generally dealt with by mid-July.

It is difficult to predict weather patterns and hence how things will grow. That is why we introduced an 'outcomes' based contract so that our contractor can be more flexible in responding to different weather patterns.

The 2017 cutting season started well in early March with the first cut being completed within four weeks. The second and third cuts started well but were disrupted by rain which saw the time for the second and third cuts fall behind by approximately two weeks.

ISS, our contractor, has mobilised an additional crew and they have almost caught up and expect the third cut to be completed by the end of June. They will then immediately start the fourth cut at the start of July and continue grass cutting during the growing period up to October. On top of the resources dedicated to grass cutting we have also worked in partnership with ISS to deal with overgrown vegetation and sight lines thereby avoiding many of the complaints we had last year.

On the positive front we have had a number of compliments from those who complained last year commenting on the improvements. We have also had a significant amount of compliments on the wild flower areas and especially those undertaken by ISS on the Showcase roundabout on the A329.

We will be extending the wild flower areas once again in 2018 so please let us know if you would like to put forward any specific areas in your respective wards. ISS has also agreed to assist in community bulb planting and are going to be working with the Wokingham District Veteran Tree Association on self-set hedgerow trees and how to develop and protect hedgerows around Cantley.

Supplementary Question

Obviously I am the Member for Winnersh so most of my experience is with Winnersh and I do know, however, that there are problems in other areas such as Arborfield, Earley and Twyford. The issue is not so much whether the cuts are delayed it is the larger areas of grass which are not being cut in exactly the same way as they were not cut last year and we resolved to sort out which bits would be cut and which bits wouldn't but they have not cut the same bits they didn't cut last year. I could give you a whole list of roads starting with Allnatt Avenue and ending with Woodward Close in Winnersh where we need to

define more clearly how the larger areas should be kept because they are just not cutting them. They are leaving areas for informal play but you can lose your football in them because small children cannot see over the top of the grass and I am not really exaggerating very much.

So could you please try and sort out those larger areas of grass and get a plan for next year so that we know what they should look like. We don't mind if the cuts are delayed by rain but we do want them to be cut and not just left.

Supplementary Answer

I will take that away. Clearly the idea of this was to let places like verges grow so that the plants and wildlife can thrive but the flipside of that was that the play areas would be cut as often as is required. So yes we need to be clear what has to be cut and at what frequency.

18.6 Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey asked the Leader of Council the following question:

Question

Shouldn't Councillors who go to functions for the WBC pay the difference between what we are allowed for reimbursement and the actual cost of the hotel?

Answer

The Members' Allowances Scheme, which is contained within the Council's Constitution, states that Members attending a conference may claim a "reasonable cost of overnight accommodation (e.g. 3* star hotel)". This is in line with the Officers' accommodation expenses scheme. However, when anyone makes a choice about overnight accommodation for conferences they need to think about more than just cost. We need to think about convenience, closeness to the conference centre, where attendees attend the event organisers might gather for example, and the safety of being in an unfamiliar place particularly at night-time

I happen to prefer the previous arrangement used by the Council, where there was an upper limit on the amount Members and Officers can claim for conferences. We could ask the Constitution Review Working Group to look at this and put the system back into the Members' Allowances Scheme and the Officers' Scheme if Members felt that was correct and make new changes. A scheme perhaps would need to reflect the fact that prices in city centres would be higher than in less urbanised areas or for example in university campuses where I have been to a number of different conferences. For example a 3* hotel in Manchester may be significantly more expensive than a 4* hotel, for example, in Bournemouth. On top of this hotels are known to increase their prices for large conferences so this would also need to be taken into account.

What we do not want is a scheme that stops Members or Officers being able to attend conferences because they are unable to claim for suitable, sensible and safe accommodation when they travel on Council business.

Supplementary Question

Since governors are expected to pay £1 every time they come for training for parking in the car park out here this is something they volunteer for. We are saying that we can spend more money on hotels, £149 possibly more than the allowance would be per night, and this could represent almost 900 governor visits. I would ask you at least if you were preparing not to do this could you give governors a special thing that says "we are

governors here for this meeting xxx date and we won't be paying for the parking this time", please?

Supplementary Answer

I think this has been raised before and a number of people come here for a number of different reasons to visit the Council offices and it was voted through to charge for car parking in the evening. We could look at it again but the question is who you charge for and who you do not and there will always be a group of people that will be particularly unhappy about being charged for or not being charged for. I can take that away to look at in terms of those who are volunteering their time but equally you could say that our Members who are coming here in the evening are also volunteering their time and the question would then be would they be charged as well. So that I would also put back to you as well.

18.7 Beth Rowland asked the Executive Member for Business and Economic Development and Regeneration the following question:

Question

In the Executive papers before you tonight you are being asked to agree to spend a further considerable amount of money purchasing property for the regeneration of Wokingham Town Centre.

The residents of Woodley along with others in the whole Borough are picking up the bill for a huge amount of borrowing to spend on one of the three towns in the Borough.

When can Woodley residents expect the same treatment – that is around £138 million being spent on Woodley Town Centre?

Answer

Later on this evening there is a proposal for a further acquisition in the town centre. As is set out in that paper it is an opportunity that has arisen and has been assessed in terms of the benefit to WBC as a whole; not only is it a good financial deal for WBC but it also adds benefits to the regeneration of the town by its adjacency to one of our current sites.

The regeneration of Wokingham is identified within the adopted Core Strategy and it also forms part of our Vision. Inside all our agendas if you look at the fourth point down in our Vision it says "Invest in regenerating towns and villages, support social and economic prosperity, whilst encouraging business growth" and this is one of our core visions.

In terms of the total cost of the regeneration scheme, and I will come back to answer your question in a second, based on the cash flow developed in April this year, it is expected to generate £3.5 million per annum financial contribution in 2022 to 2023 when the whole scheme is complete and fully income producing. This figure is after meeting the cost of interest on the borrowing; at 2.8% interest per annum, the current PWLB rate that has been secured. This potentially rises to £4.4m income after the debt is fully repaid; currently estimated to be financial year 2029/30.

This surplus is for the benefit of all our residents, including those who live in Woodley. Not only are we regenerating the town of Wokingham, providing additional homes, local employment and creating a great place to shop, it also makes a significant financial contribution for the benefit of all the residents across the whole of the Borough.

We will continue to evaluate other opportunities that make sense when they present themselves and make financial sense across the Borough. So it is for the whole of the Borough not just for the Wokingham residents.

Supplementary Question

I have lived in Woodley for about 40 years and been a Member of this Council for well over 20 years and a few years ago the Conservative Administration sold off the premises that they owned in Woodley. They sold the Woodley silver and took the cash then.

The imbalance of spending in this Borough, between Wokingham and Woodley and the other towns and villages, is clearly not fair. The Authority needs to be less Wokingham centric. I would like you to assure us that all future spending will be fair and equitable in the Borough and I am very sad that not I, or many of my residents, will live long enough to see any work done in Woodley town centre that repays them for what they have paid for Wokingham town centre.

Supplementary Answer

I would just like to point out that my colleagues have reminded me that there are two extra care home facilities in Woodley and also there have been quite a lot of leisure developments in Woodley. I hear what you are saying. This was a process that we are starting across the Borough and I think my brief is to do town centres and villages throughout the Borough not just to concentrate on one place but we started with one place quite rightly.

The Leader of Council stated that every time we bring something here in terms of investment it is to generate income as well which can then be spent in other areas in the Borough. It can either be spent as investment or as revenue to then help our more vulnerable throughout the community. So it is not just limited to spend again in Wokingham; it can be spent throughout the whole of the Borough.

19. SHAREHOLDERS' REPORT

(Councillors Norman Jorgensen, David Lee, Stuart Munro and Simon Weeks declared personal interests in this item)

The Executive considered a report setting out the budget monitoring position for the month ending 30 April 2017; the operational update for the period to 31 May 2017 of the Council Owned Companies and the changes to the senior leadership structure of Optalis Limited.

The Executive Member for Finance went through the report and provided background to the structure of the companies and the membership of the various Boards. Members were reminded that the Optalis Group was split out from WBC Holdings on 1 April 2017 following the formation of a partnership with the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead. It was noted that the Managing Director of Optalis had since resigned and a recruitment campaign for a successor would start in July. It was expected that this would provide a great opportunity to move the company forward and explore opportunities for new contracts and potentially find more clients.

Councillor Whittle advised the meeting that the financial information contained in the report only covered the first month of the financial year and no variations from budget were showing.

Councillor Lee highlighted that one of the ventures that both the Housing Company and Optalis were involved in was Fosters, the new extra care housing development at

Woodley. Members were pleased to note that a number of houses at Phoenix Avenue had recently been handed over and the people who had moved into these were very pleased with their new homes. The scheme would also be generating substantial income to the Council.

RESOLVED that:

- 1) the budget monitoring position for the month ending 30 April 2017 be noted;
- 2) the operational update for the period to 31 May 2017 be noted;
- 3) the changes to the senior leadership structure of Optalis Limited be noted.

20. MAP-BASED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS (TROS) FORMAL CONSULTATION

The Executive considered a report setting out the results of a consultation on proposals for a map-based Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to replace the current system of text-based TROs.

The Executive Member for Highways and Transport advised that the report was concerned with the consultation which was conducted in April to prepare for the digitisation of existing traffic regulation orders in the Borough which pertained to parking. Councillor Bowring explained that currently TROs were held in paper form but it was proposed to update the way that TROs were dealt with to enable all the parking regulations to be placed on the Council's website in colour. Residents would be able to see precisely where the regulations applied and other information including times at which the regulations apply.

Councillor Bowring further stated that the opportunity would also be taken to look at the operation of parking permits with a view to providing a more flexible and easy to use service. It was noted that the digitisation process of TROs was also a prerequisite for the introduction of Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) whereby the Council would take over the regulation of traffic from the police; which would provide the ability to improve road safety, manage traffic congestion in a better way and enforce parking regulations. It was also confirmed that CPE was likely to be introduced in the early part of October this year.

RESOLVED that:

- 1) the making of the Wokingham Borough Council (Various Roads, Wokingham Borough)(Stopping, Waiting, Loading and Unloading Prohibitions and Restrictions, Parking Places and Resident Permit Parking Places)(Map-Based) Order 2017 be approved;
- 2) Officers be authorised to inform respondents of the results of the consultation.

21. BUS SERVICES IN WOODLEY AND EARLEY

The Executive considered a report setting out options for the provision of the 19a and 19c bus routes; the contract for which was due to come to an end in September 2017.

The Executive Member for Highways and Transport advised the meeting that the 19a and 19c bus routes were services, including providing access to the Royal Berkshire Hospital and Reading town centre, which offered lifelines to some of the most deprived and vulnerable residents in the Woodley and Earley area. Due to rising costs Reading Buses

was now requiring a higher subsidy from the Council who were now having to look at not only the benefits to residents but the overall cost of providing such services.

Councillor Bowring advised that the previous contract had expired in May but following protracted negotiations the contract was extended until September 2017. An interim arrangement was now being considered to safeguard the valued service over the next 12 months. Members were advised that Option 4 was the preferred option as it best maintained the current service in terms of route and frequency of service for a reasonable cost to the Council.

Councillor Ashwell asked if consideration had been given to carrying out a review of all bus services supported by the Council and it was agreed that it was probably an opportune time to consider the Council's strategy, including ways of trying to get people to use their cars less and use public transport more.

Although supportive of the proposal Councillor Jorgensen felt that there was a need to look at the way services would be provided in the future and the routes that the buses followed. In particular there was a need to consider a more direct route for the 19a and 19c buses.

The Leader of Council gave thanks to the bus company for agreeing to let the Council place advertising on these buses and also for the partnership working.

RESOLVED that:

- 1) Option 4 be implemented as presented in the report that maintains for one year an hourly service on the existing 19a and 19c bus routes, whilst a new contract is put in place through a tender process;
- 2) options be explored to make the provision of these bus routes more financially sustainable through identifying alternative sources of funding;
- 3) a supplementary estimate for £35,225 for 17/18 be approved and the pressure of £8,958 growth for 18/19 be noted.

22. ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY (THE LODGE) DUE TO THE ARBORFIELD CROSS RELIEF ROAD

The Executive considered a report proposing the purchase of the Lodge in Arborfield following a wish by the current owners to sell their property due in part to its immediate proximity to the approved alignment of the Arborfield Cross relief road and the impact it would have on them and their future plans.

The Executive Member for Strategic Highways and Planning informed the meeting that if people lived near a roadway such as this and it impacted on them they had a minimum of 12 months after the opening of the new road to claim compensation. Councillor Lee reminded the meeting that the Executive had adopted the Discretionary Land Acquisition Policy for Highway Works in March 2017 which enabled people who were directly affected in certain circumstances to apply for compensation before the road was built.

Members were keen that the property would be rented out at the earliest opportunity in order to achieve rental income that would over time mitigate the acquisition costs.

Following a query about when work on the relief road was due to start it was noted that it would take around a year to carry out all the surveys along the route and make sure that there was no ground water.

RESOLVED that the purchase of The Lodge be agreed in principal and Officers be authorised to undertake:

- 1) detailed negotiations with the property owners to establish a draft heads of terms for sale and proceed on acquiring the property;
- 2) the purchase of The Lodge is delegated to the Director of Corporate Services and Director of Customer and Locality Services in consultation with the Executive Members for Highways and Transport and Planning and Regeneration to proceed and make the discretionary purchase of The Lodge;
- 3) detailed discussions with Property Services to optimise the use of the asset whilst owned by the Council and minimise the impact on existing project budget as outlined in the Financial Implications Section.

23. A COMMERCIAL OPPORTUNITY TO ACQUIRE A WOKINGHAM TOWN CENTRE PROPERTY

The Executive considered a report relating to a commercial opportunity to acquire a Wokingham Town Centre property.

The Executive Member for Business and Economic Development and Regeneration advised the meeting that the proposal was a great opportunity to acquire a property which was situated right in the middle of the town centre next to the Council's existing sites. This would enable economies of scale in terms of the ongoing management of the site; whilst generating a healthy revenue stream to fund vital services.

Councillor McGhee-Sumner wanted to ensure that an independent valuation would be sought from valuers not used previously to ensure that the Council was not overpaying for the asset.

RESOLVED: That the opportunity presented be taken and the acquisition of this key property within the town (as set out in the Part 2 report) be agreed, subject to the outcome of the due diligence process.

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
PERSONNEL BOARD
HELD ON 29 JUNE 2017 FROM 6.30 PM TO 7.30 PM**

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Alistair Auty (Chairman), Stuart Munro (Vice-Chairman), UllaKarin Clark, Lindsay Ferris, Charlotte Haitham Taylor, Pauline Helliard-Symons and Charles Margetts

Officers Present

Madeleine Shopland, Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist
Sarah Swindley, Human Resources Lead Specialist

1. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence received.

2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Board held on 20 March 2017 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

3. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

4. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no public questions.

5. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

There were no Member questions.

6. APPOINTMENT TO POST OF CHIEF EXECUTIVE

The Board received and considered a report detailing the options for the process to appoint to the post of Chief Executive, following the announcement that the current Chief Executive would be leaving in August 2017.

During the discussion of this item, the following points were made:

- Members were informed that Andy Couldrick, the current Chief Executive, would be leaving on 11 August 2017.
- Sarah Swindley outlined the preferred option; a fixed term external Interim Chief Executive, on a 3 days per week basis, or an internal secondment to Interim Chief Executive. An interim Chief Executive would be sought for a period of 6 months. An Executive Search Company would be appointed to undertake the recruitment of a permanent Chief Executive during that period.
- Councillor Helliard-Symons commented that she believed that the post of interim Chief Executive should be open to both internal and external candidates. Senior officers were already very busy, particularly with the implementation of 21st Century Council.
- Councillor Margetts stated that he agreed with the proposal to appoint an Interim Chief Executive initially.
- Members discussed when an Interim Chief Executive would be expected to be available from.
- The Board considered the proposed Job Description and Person Specification. With regards to the Person Specification Part 2 Skills and Experience, Councillor

Haitham Taylor emphasised the importance of candidates having the ambition and an understanding of business and enterprise in order to realise opportunities, in the current financially constrained times.

- Councillor Margetts questioned whether reference should be made to 21st century Council and also to having the ability to successfully lobby central government. Councillor Haitham Taylor suggested that point 4 of the person specification Personal Style and Behaviour be expanded to make reference to having a willingness to lobby central government on issues that affect the Council. She also commented that any permanent candidate should be able to steer the Council as it moved on from 21st century council in the future. Sarah Swindley proposed that the 21st century council operating model be made available to candidates.
- Members discussed the possibility of a fixed term external Interim Chief Executive, on a 3 days per week basis. Some Members questioned whether 3 days a week would be sufficient.
- A number of Members expressed concern that if an external interim was appointed for 6 months' on 3 days per week; it would cost £92,820 against a budget of £87,970. It was appreciated that it was important to appoint the best candidate.
- The Board considered market data for Chief Executive total compensation packages for Unitary Authorities in the South East.
- Sarah Swindley explained that the market had shifted significantly since the Council had last appointed an interim Chief Executive. Previously the salary offered by the Council had been mid-range but that figure was now at the lower end of the scale.
- The Board discussed the salary for a permanent candidate. It was agreed that a salary range should be advertised in order to attract good candidates. The level of experience that a candidate had would have an effect on the salary agreed for the successful candidate. Members felt that a salary of between £125,000 and £145,000 (plus 10% performance related pay) would be both competitive and appropriate for a permanent candidate.
- Officers indicated that an email would be sent to all employees as soon as possible, asking for expressions of interest in the interim Chief Executive post. Following the closure of the application a Personnel Board meeting would be arranged to shortlist candidates if required, and following that, a meeting to make a decision regarding appointment.

RESOLVED: That

- 1) the resignation and imminent departure of the current Chief Executive Officer be noted;
- 2) the options, for replacement of the Chief Executive Officer and legal requirements be considered;
- 3) the draft Job Description and Person Specification be agreed subject to amendments discussed at the Board meeting.
- 4) the timescales for any recruitment process be noted;
- 5) proceeding with Option 2c) in the report, i.e. internal and external recruitment for:
 - a. A fixed term external Interim Chief Executive, on a 3 days per week basis, or
 - b. An internal secondment to Interim Chief Executivebe supported;

- 6) the commencement of a permanent recruitment campaign on the proposed compensation package be agreed.

7. UPDATED PAY POLICY STATEMENT

The Personnel Board received the draft Pay Policy Statement for 2017.

During the discussion of this item, the following points were made:

- The Statement reflected the Council's pay arrangements as at 1 April 2017.
- While there had been no change to Senior Management pay the gap was narrowing, despite the average salary increasing.
- It was noted that a number of senior manager posts had changed following 21st century Council. This would be reflected in future versions of the Pay Policy Statement.

RESOLVED: That the Personnel Board approve the draft Pay Policy Statement for 2017 and recommend its agreement to Full Council.

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
LICENSING AND APPEALS COMMITTEE
HELD ON 3 JULY 2017 FROM 7.00 PM TO 8.20 PM**

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Barrie Patman (Chairman), Lindsay Ferris, Mike Haines, Emma Hobbs, John Jarvis, Abdul Loyes, Malcolm Richards and Beth Rowland

Officers Present

Luciane Bowker, Democratic and Elections Services Specialist
Julia O'Brien, Licensing Team Leader
Amanda Ward, Principal Licensing Officer
Laura Driscoll, Principal Officer, Public Protection Partnership

15. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted from Councillors John Halsall, Philip Mirfin, Chris Bowring, Wayne Smith and Bill Soane.

16. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

17. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

18. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no public questions.

19. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

There were no Member questions.

20. SAFEGUARDING TRAINING FOR HACKNEY CARRIAGE, PRIVATE HIRE DRIVERS AND SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY TRANSPORT VEHICLE DRIVERS

The Committee considered the Safeguarding Training for Hackney Carriage, Private Hire and School and Community Transport Vehicle Drivers report which was set out in agenda pages 9-18.

Julia O'Brien, Licensing Team Leader explained that the report contained information which had been collected over a number of years which evidenced that there was an identified serious risk to the safety of children which could be reduced through appropriate training of taxi drivers and operators. There had been a number of high profile and significant cases in recent years pertaining to the sexual exploitation of children. In order to diminish the risk it was proposed that safeguarding training for all existing drivers and new drivers became compulsory.

Julia informed that should the Committee approve the recommendations, there would be a consultation with members of the taxi trade upon the introduction of the training and how it could best be delivered.

Julia stated that Bracknell had identified training providers and the course would cost £20 per attendee. A booking system would be created and different venues and dates would

be offered to drivers. Existing drivers would be asked to undertake the training to obtain a renewal of their licence.

In response to a question Julia stated that there was a database of around 450 licenced drivers.

Julia envisaged that refresher courses would be offered every three years.

During the discussion of the item the following comments were made:

- Julia stated that if significant changes to the safeguarding guidance occurred, drivers would be sent a letter with updates and/ or information would be included in the trade newsletter;
- In response to a question Julia stated that school transport offered training for school drivers in the form of an assessment. Going forward this training would take precedence over the school transport training;
- In response to a question Julia stated that the Licensing Authority did not have jurisdiction over escorts as this fell under school transport legislation. However, she believed that escorts did receive safeguarding training;
- In response to a question Julia stated that Uber had not submitted an application to become an operator in Wokingham;
- In response to a question Julia clarified that Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) was undertaken every three years. Officers were not aware of any other local authorities who enforced DBS checks more often than every three years;
- Councillor Hobbs felt that three years was a long time and a lot could happen in that time, she believed that DBS checks should be undertaken more often;
- In response to a question Julia stated that DBS checks were returned within two to three weeks;
- Julia clarified that under Wokingham Borough Council's Licensing Policy, Officers could take into account spent convictions when considering licence applications;
- Julia confirmed that drivers had to give up licences with other local authorities in order to hold a licence with Wokingham. In response to a question Julia stated that there was communication between local authorities to establish if drivers had given up their licences upon taking a licence with Wokingham;
- Councillor Rowland asked what would happen if drivers responded negatively to the consultation. Julia stated that holding a consultation was considered best practice. Councillor Patman believed that genuine concerns would be taken into account;
- In response to a question Julia stated that there would not be a pass/ fail test at the end of the course. The training was going to be interactive and trainers would be able to advise if they felt someone had not understood the contents and needed to re-take the course;
- Members questioned if the level of proficiency in the English language was taken into account during the application process. Julia explained that there were tests in place and drivers who failed the English language test would not be issued a licence.

RESOLVED That the Licensing and Appeals Committee agrees with the recommendations contained in the report which were:

- 1) to introduce mandatory safeguarding training for all hackney carriage and private hire vehicle drivers and operators and
- 2) to consult with members of the taxi trade upon the introduction of the training and how it can best be delivered.

21. INFORMATION REPORT ON THE HOUSE OF LORDS SELECT COMMITTEE REVIEW OF LICENSING ACT 2003

The Committee considered the information report on the House of Lords Select Committee Review of Licensing Act 2003 which was set out in agenda pages 19-22.

Laura Driscoll, Principal Officer, Public Protection Partnership explained that on 25 May 2016 the House of Lords appointed a Select Committee to “consider and report on the Licensing Act 2003”. The report of this Committee, “The Licensing Act 2003: post-legislative scrutiny” was published on 4 April 2017.

Laura expected that the government would be issuing a response, however she was not sure when this would be.

Laura noted that the Select Committee had unfortunately reviewed a number of poor examples of Licensing Committees and as a result recommended shifting Licensing to Planning.

Councillor Patman stated that many processes had to take place before any changes could happen in law.

During the discussion of the item the following comments were made:

- Laura stated that it was possible that mandatory training be introduced;
- Laura stated that Officers were in support of some of the recommendations, for example to abolish the need to advertise in newspapers;
- Members of the Committee were not in favour of the recommendation to move Licensing to Planning and asked what could be done to express their views. Laura informed that there would certainly be a consultation if these changes were proposed;
- Officers would liaise with other local authorities and respond to any consultations accordingly;
- Members were in favour of the introduction of minimum training for Licensing Committees;
- Officers were in contact with the Local Government Association (LGA) regarding this issues.

The Committee asked to be kept updated on the outcome of the review and any other proposals to change the law.

RESOLVED That the report be noted.

22. ADOPTION OF BYLAWS FOR DERMAL TREATMENTS

The Committee received the Adoption of Bylaws for Dermal Treatments report which was set out in agenda pages 23-32.

Amanda Ward, Principal Officer, Licensing explained that it was necessary to adopt bylaws in order to regulate: cosmetic piercing; semi-permanent skin colouring; acupuncture, tattooing, electrolysis and ear piercing.

Amanda stated that it was important that this industry was effectively regulated due to the risks associated with the treatments being offered. There was the potential risk of transmission of blood borne viruses (BBV) for example HIV, Hepatitis B and C, as well as

other infections, potential physical damage and bleeding if the treatment was completed incorrectly.

Councillor Ferris stated that he had undertaken some research and found that some local authorities had adopted a separate bylaw for acupuncture. He was of the opinion that acupuncture should be regulated by its own bylaw as it was a medical procedure and not a cosmetic treatment. He felt that the proposal was confusing in its description. Other councillors were of the same opinion.

Julia informed that under the current legislation medical professionals did not need to apply for a licence in order to practice acupuncture. She believed that it was better to consolidate acupuncture with the other dermal procedures under one bylaw.

During the discussion of the item the following comments were made:

- Councillor Hobbs believed that it would be more coherent to have acupuncture under a separate bylaw;
- Councillor Richards believed that acupuncture was significantly different from other dermal treatments and should be separated;
- Councillor Ferris asked Officers to provide more background information to enable the Committee to make an informed decision;
- Councillor Loyes asked about the cost implications. Julia stated that this service was cost recoverable and agreed to include the costs to any future reports;
- Julia believed that other local authorities that had separate bylaws for acupuncture had probably used old legislation;
- Julia pointed out that there was a cost implication in submitting two bylaws.

After much debate the Committee was not able to reach a decision on a recommendation for Council. Therefore, the Committee asked that Officers produced a report containing two alternatives to be considered at Council:

- 1) Option 1 – the adoption of one bylaw regulating all dermal treatments, including acupuncture;
- 2) Option 2 – the adoption of two bylaws, once for acupuncture and one for all the other dermal treatments.

The Committee requested that more background information and costs be included in the report to Council.

RESOLVED That a report containing the two options listed above will be submitted to Council.

Subsequently, in consultation with the Chairman, Officers and the Committee, it was agreed that this report should come back to the September meeting for further analysis and agreement on a recommendation, prior to its submission to Council.