



**WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**MINUTES OF COMMITTEE MEETINGS
FOR THE PERIOD**

28 May 2018 to 9 July 2018

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

Manjeet Gill
Interim Chief Executive
Published on 11 July 2018



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.
Minutes of meeting Thursday, 31 May 2018 of Executive	5 - 18
4 June Individual Executive Member Decisions 23	19 - 20
4 June Individual Executive Member Decisions 26	21 - 22
Minutes of meeting Wednesday, 6 June 2018 of School Admissions Forum	23 - 30
Minutes of meeting Wednesday, 6 June 2018 of Audit Committee	31 - 38
Minutes of meeting Wednesday, 13 June 2018 of Planning Committee	39 - 44
Minutes of meeting Wednesday, 13 June 2018 of Special Council Executive Committee	45 - 46
14 June Individual Executive Member Decisions 24	47 - 48
14 June Individual Executive Member Decisions 25	49 - 50
Minutes of meeting Thursday, 14 June 2018 of Health and Wellbeing Board	51 - 58
Minutes of meeting Monday, 18 June 2018 of Community and Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee	59 - 62
Minutes of meeting Wednesday, 20 June 2018 of Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee	63 - 68
Minutes of meeting Monday, 25 June 2018 of Planning Committee	69 - 74
Minutes of meeting Wednesday, 27 June 2018 of Licensing and Appeals Committee	75 - 84
28 June Individual Executive Member Decisions 27	85 - 86
Minutes of meeting Thursday, 28 June 2018 of Executive	87 - 94

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF
THE EXECUTIVE
HELD ON 31 MAY 2018 FROM 7.30 PM TO 8.10 PM**

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Charlotte Haitham Taylor (Chairman), Keith Baker, Richard Dolinski, Norman Jorgensen, Pauline Jorgensen, Philip Mirfin, Stuart Munro and Simon Weeks

Other Councillors Present

Parry Batth
Laura Blumenthal
Gary Cowan
Andy Croy
Lindsay Ferris
Charles Margetts
Ian Pittock
Helen Power
Malcolm Richards
Imogen Shepherd-DuBey
Chris Smith
Shahid Younis

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted from Councillors Pauline Helliar-Symons and Julian McGhee-Sumner.

Councillor Shahid Younis attended the meeting on behalf of Councillor Pauline Helliar-Symons and Councillor Charles Margetts on behalf of Julian McGhee-Sumner. In accordance with legislation Councillor Younis and Margetts could take part in any discussions but were not entitled to vote.

2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Executive held on 29 March 2018 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

The Minutes of the Extraordinary Executive held on 16 May 2018 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman subject to the addition of Councillor Norman Jorgensen's apologies.

3. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Councillor Norman Jorgensen declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 6 Shareholders' Report by virtue of the fact that his wife was a paid Non-Executive Director of WBC Holdings Ltd. Councillor Jorgensen remained in the meeting during discussions and voted on the matter.

Councillors Pauline Jorgensen and Stuart Munro declared personal interests in Agenda Item 6 Shareholders' Report by virtue of the fact that they were paid Non-Executive Director of WBC Holdings Ltd. Councillors Jorgensen and Munro remained in the meeting during discussions and voted on the matter.

Councillors Philip Mirfin and Charles Margetts declared personal interests in Agenda Item 6 Shareholders' Report by virtue of the fact that they were paid Non-Executive Directors of Optalis Holdings Ltd. Councillor Mirfin remained in the meeting during discussions and voted on the matter. Councillor Margetts remained in the meeting during discussions but in accordance with regulations did not vote on the matter.

4. STATEMENT BY THE EXECUTIVE MEMBER FOR REGENERATION

Councillor Mirfin read out a statement relating to the incident at the former Paddocks Car Park on Bank Holiday Monday. Councillor Mirfin stated how shocked everyone had been to learn of the incident and how everyone's thoughts were very much with the victim during this difficult time. Wokingham was a safe town and incidents like this were rare but nonetheless reports of this nature would quite understandably cause concern in the community.

Councillor Mirfin advised that in the light of the incident the area was being reviewed and it was intended very shortly to install CCTV on the walk-way through from the former Paddocks Car Park. The Council would, of course, assist Thames Valley Police with the ongoing investigation as appropriate. Councillor Mirfin urged anyone who had any information relating to the case to call 101 or contact Crimestoppers anonymously.

5. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

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

5.1 Marina Stone had asked the Executive Member for Children's Services the following question:

Question

I would like to ask what has been put in place to manage the increased amount of referrals received in children services as a result of the increasing Wokingham population and the recent government campaign encouraging the public to report child abuse? Although I support this campaign there would have surely been some thought into how this would be managed. Currently social workers are already feeling pressured carrying a high caseload of children and working an unreasonable amount of hours which is impacting on their emotional and physical health and also the service they would like to provide for families. We need more social workers or social worker assistants so that we can "Improve the customer experience when accessing Council services".

Answer

As Ms Stone was unable to attend the meeting the following written answer was provided:

In line with national level trends the department is acutely aware of the increase in the demand for statutory services, which has seen an ongoing rise since September 2017. There is no supporting evidence to underpin any suggestions that there is a direct correlation between government campaigns and increase demand. Evidence illustrates that the increased demand in the main is more likely to be underpinned by a range of complex socio-economic factors, which has been impacting most Children's Services Departments across the region and country over the last 12 to 18 months.

The Assistant Director for Children's Social Care has developed an evidenced based business case for additional staff. This has been scoped based upon current and projected demand across the service. The increased service staffing capacity will enable the service

to be better positioned to respond to the changing needs and demand for children's social care services locally.

The business case requests additional qualified social work staff for key areas of statutory services.

In the meantime there has been additional staffing provided to teams over and above current workforce.

We value our social workers and the work they do in our communities, having to work anti-social hours, under complex and challenging circumstances.

The Children's Social Care management team are reviewing all case- loads and cases to ensure that essential and appropriate work is held by case holding social workers, with proportionate levels of oversight and supervision being provided for practitioners to reduce the potential for risk.

6. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

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

6.1 Ian Pittock asked the Deputy Executive Member for Children's Services the following question:

Question

Can the appropriate new Executive Member for Children's Services advise me what arrangements have been made for public access to the new leisure facilities at Arborfield Green, in particular during school hours?

Answer

Having recently signed our new 15 year Leisure Contract with Places for People, we are delighted to say that from Monday 15th May 2018, Arborfield Leisure Centre is in full operation to members of the public. A full programme of activities has now been developed including spinning, aerobics, a 50 station gym, eight badminton courts which are also marked out for netball, basketball, football and handball, with an outstanding climbing wall ready to use. As well as a new 3G pitch, two netball courts and three tennis courts all with floodlights. Grass football pitches will be available from September 2018 ready for the new 2018/19 Football Season.

Opening hours for the gym, studio and spinning studios are from 7.30am-10.00pm Monday to Friday, and on Saturday 7.30am-6.00pm, and on Sunday 8.00am-8.00pm. The sports hall will be available to the public from 5.30pm-10.30pm Monday to Friday, and all day at the weekends. Taking fully into account the lease arrangements and safeguarding with Bohunt School the ground floor will be available to the School Monday to Friday during the school term.

If members of the public wish to view these new facilities, I will arrange for a member of staff to show potential members around the Leisure Centre.

Supplementary Question

I am glad to see them open they are excellent. Residents were promised that if we kept the huge MOD gym rather than knock it down and build a standard school gym that

residents would be given access to the main hall containing the rock wall during the school day. They would not be locked out from this overly large hall. Aren't your arrangements contrary to the promises made to residents?

Supplementary Answer

Can I come back to you on that one so that I can give you a more detailed and considered response.

6.2 Gary Cowan asked the Leader of the Council the following question:

Question

With the unfortunate loss of the one person who was putting effort into sorting the current and future transport problems around Wokingham in line with the overwhelming support from Council which are only set to get much worse who will now lead on this?

Answer

As per my announcement at Full Council last week Councillor Keith Baker will continue to lead on highways, which will now also include strategic transport matters. For highways issues related specifically to Wokingham Town Centre regeneration Philip Mirfin will lead on these matters.

Supplementary Question

I was very impressed with the press release on progress with the pretty pictures but it raised the point was there, or is there, a set end date for this work and if so what is, or was it?

I asked a very similar question of Officers for the Shinfield by-pass and I said is there a scheduled date for the completion of this works. The answer I got was that we are only the licensing authority we have no say in the end date. The point I am trying to make is the work that is going on in the town centre which is causing all the chaos. I am assuming that as a Council that when you put that contract in place you actually agreed with the developer that there would be an end date for that work and I am just asking you what is, or what was, the end date for that contract?

Supplementary Answer

You eluded first of all to the Shinfield Eastern Relief Road with that we were not the contractor but Hochtief was contracted by the University of Reading so we were not in control of that contract.

With regards to the town centre, as you no doubt will be aware, once they started to uncover what was underneath in the town centre there was a huge number of pipes and a complete spaghetti of different works being laid on top of each other over decades and decades. It was a lot more complicated than originally thought so it has taken longer than was expected.

In terms of the final date the schedule at the moment is to finish at the end of July.

6.3 Chris Smith asked the Executive Member for Highways and Transport the following question:

Question

Can I have an update on recent and planned works on bus stops in Earley?

Answer

First of all I must sincerely apologise to Councillors for my incomplete answer to your question at last week's Full Council around road activity in Hillside. My answer was given in good faith based on the information provided to me. I was as surprised as you were when comments on social media indicated activity on a bus stop further down Ryehill Way. I have escalated this to the highest level as withholding information, either deliberately or by accident, is simply not acceptable. A full-scale investigation is currently underway by the relevant Director and local Councillors will be kept fully informed of any outcome from this.

Now the project around bus stops in Earley has almost been completed. In all cases other than the two on Ryehill Way the other laybys simple required a refreshment of the markings and have been completed. So, what about these two laybys – why are they different.

We sincerely apologise again for the unexpected and unavoidable delay in completing the works at Ryhill Way bus layby and the works that are now taking place at Rosemary Ave.

To give you a brief overview of what has caused the delays at Ryhill Way, a standard design, which had been implemented elsewhere across the Borough, was used as part of the construction originally and no unusual issues were identified at the time. However, undulations on the surface were brought to our attention and deeper excavation took place which identified unexpected and unusual ground conditions.

Our contractor undertook ground testing of the exposed problem area and based on these results a final solution was agreed and the works were completed last week.

Both Ryhill Way and Rosemary Ave bus la-bys were originally part of the same project and the initial works were carried out at the same time. When the ground testing was carried out at the other bus layby the team decided, as a precaution, it would be wise to check the Rosemary Ave bus layby as well. Similar undulations were also found in Rosemary Avenue.

Testing was also carried out and the results came back similar to that of the Ryhill Way bus layby but not as severe. However, to avoid another long and drawn out situation, it was decided that the same successful resolution used at Ryhill should be carried out at the Rosemary Ave bus layby. Furthermore it should be started as soon as possible which was this week with a scheduled completion of Tuesday 5th June subject to weather conditions.

Supplementary Question

Firstly thank you for arranging most of the works during half term. That is a busy road that leads up to one of the main primary schools in Hillside so at least a lot of the works will be less disruptive.

Given the issues with the Ryhill Way bus stop, particularly the lack of communications I and my fellow Councillors in the Ward received, I was incredibly disappointed to find out about the works on the bus stop only once they had started. Indeed I received a written response from you at 6.15 on the Tuesday stating that there were no planned works other than the Redhatch Drive resurfacing at which point the contractors would already have

been on site and had equipment there. So what will be changed to ensure I and other Councillors are kept informed about these works in the future?

Supplementary Answer

I have already said that a detailed investigation at the highest level is going on and as soon as the outcome of that is known I will communicate that with the Hillside Councillors so that they understand what happened and I am expecting the Directors to put in place measures to make sure that that never happens again. I felt extremely embarrassed giving an answer that was not complete and I never want to be in that position again and I will make sure that it doesn't happen.

6.4 Parry Batth asked the Deputy Executive Member for Finance the following question:

Question

WBC Housing Companies such as WHL, Loddon Homes etc. have been building affordable homes for some time but little exposure is available to the outside world. Would the Exec Member please provide details of the current and future build plans and provide details of the types of houses rented or sold?

Answer:

Last year was a landmark year for the Council's housing companies with 123 affordable homes reaching completion. Whilst there is not time to go through all of this I would mention in particular the 68 general needs homes at Phoenix, 34 rented extra care homes at Fosters and a supported housing scheme for nine vulnerable young people in Reading Road.

Wokingham Housing is firming up proposals for its future development programme which includes 140 new homes, with 30 homes currently on site across the Borough, eg Norton Road in Wokingham three houses to rent and six apartments for shared ownership, as well as two shared ownership homes in Ruscombe. Also the housing companies will purchase 22 apartments at Peach Place for key workers.

Looking ahead of course there is the Gorse Ride estate in Finchampstead which will be a major project for our housing companies. A planning application for Phase 1 in Arnett Avenue is expected next month, while work continues on the rest of the programme. The overall regeneration project at Gorse Ride will provide a total of around 290 new homes, a net gain of 80. And of course as they say there is always more to come.

Supplementary Question

There were actually four affordable flats built in my Ward in Anson Walk on wasteland that was being misused by kids and anti-social behaviour was rife. The locals actually asked me what we could do with this piece of land and I identified that plot of land to WHL and they very successfully built four flats there and they were completed in January. I believe some of them are unoccupied and I was just wondering why are they still unoccupied. It is now the end of May. When will they be occupied?

Supplementary Answer

I do not know the answer to that at the moment but I will be very happy to find out and come back to you directly.

6.5 Imogen Shepherd-DuBey asked the Executive Member for Highways and Transport the following question:

Question

I would like to ask the following question on the Revenue Monitoring 2017\2018 Outturn:

Page 43 of the General Fund Summary - Carry Forwards refers to School Crossing Patrollers. It states that the Budget spend is aligned with the phased approach to ending the delivery of the SCP Service.

Does this mean that Wokingham Borough Council is intending to remove ALL School Crossing Patrollers regardless of the results of the consultations and the concerns of parents and local residents?

Answer

Your proposition that the lack of a budget item automatically means ignoring the results of a consultation is unfortunately way too simplistic. All consultation responses are extensively reviewed to see if they are appropriate first and if so how extensive is that view.

As an example, in April 2017 from phase 1 of this action a significant proportion of the comments received related to general road safety issues, i.e. poor driving, speeding vehicles, inconsiderate parking.

In the current consultation, which is currently being finalised, the general road safety issues raised were dangerous driving, speeding vehicles again and poor parking. None of these issues are reduced or removed by the presence of a School Crossing Patroller so therefore those issues are not appropriate for this particular action.

Phase 1 patrollers were removed from the eight locations where they were operating on some form of pedestrian crossing. May I remind you that a pedestrian crossing has far more "power" to stop traffic than a patroller, often putting their lives at risk, stepping into the road to stop the traffic. All drivers are used to stopping when someone steps onto the crossing as they encounter them all over the Borough and all over the country. Unlike a patroller where there are only 15 of them initially across the whole Borough so a driver may never, ever, have encountered one.

They are also available 24 hours a day and not just around school times so the overall safety of crossing that road is improved significantly. So, all residents benefit not just the parents and children.

Importantly this change has been successfully implemented in phase 1 with no recorded increase in safety issues.

In 2015 this Council made a decision to remove all patrollers but only where there was a viable safe mechanism of crossing the road for parents and children. This requirement was a key reason for the delay you mentioned. That work has now been completed and each of the locations where the remaining seven patrollers operate are planned to have pedestrian crossings of some form before the start of the new academic year, in September. As with phase 1, when they have been installed the patrollers will then be phased out.

Supplementary Question

I am afraid I rather disagree with your statement. No way can an automated crossing anticipate how children are going to behave and how cars are going to behave. It just is impossible.

When are the parents going to see the results of the consultation and will they be involved in it?

Supplementary Answer

As I said already the consultation is currently being put together and that will be made public probably in the next couple of weeks, something like that. But may I remind you that the decision has already been taken to take the action so the people who have commented will clearly be interested but there are no grounds for changing our action.

6.6 Lindsay Ferris asked the Deputy Executive Member for Finance the following question:

Question

Page 44 of the Agenda clearly shows how the Council is eating into its reserves.

As of 31/03/2017 the Council's reserves stood at £10,036m. At this meeting this figure (as of 31/03/2018) now stands at £7,525m, a drop of £2.511m over the last 12 months. This represents a fall of over 25% in the General Fund Balance (also known as reserves). This £2.511m also represents an overspend of circa 3% in Council Tax.

Clearly the ruling administration is losing control of costs, can the Executive Member explain how he intends to rectify this issue?

Answer

I don't think it will come as a surprise to you that I do not accept that the ruling Administration is losing control of its costs.

The first point I would like to make is that the like for like comparison to the £10m reserves you quote at 31/3/17, is £9.1m at 31/3/18 and not £7.5m. This is a reduction of less than 10%, not the 25% as you claim.

Throughout the year we have reported the significant budget pressures faced as a result of the increases in Adults' and Children's costs. To give you some headlines for that, basically to stand behind it, our demand for child protection plans up to April 2017 50 children; up to April 2018 139 children – 178% increase. Children in care April 2017 73, March 2018 106 – 45% increase.

The same is replicated across adult services also. Core adult mental health assessment quarter 3 2017-18 199 assessments for all of 2016- 202 and a 40% increase on top of that over the last three years generally in people accessing adult social care services. These are all statutory services so that we have to accept the demand basically that is coming in.

We have a long standing record of strong financial management, at this Council, which includes the close monitoring of our expenditure and putting measures in place to control escalating costs, and ensuring that we have a safe level of reserves. I am confident we will continue to do this, despite the severely escalating care needs of the community; which as

I am sure you are aware is an issue which is national and not simply related to Wokingham Borough.

Supplementary Question

I would like you to turn to page 44 because on page 44 it says General Fund Balance at 31/3/17 £10.036m (in Appendix C) and a bit further down it says General Fund Balance 31/3/18 after carry forwards £7.525m. I therefore challenge your figures which you have just said to me and I would like you to explain why my comments are incorrect because I cannot see any difference - £10.036m and £7.525m is £2.511m. So I significantly challenge your figures and I think it shows that the Council cannot add up.

My question now is that we have lost a quarter of our balances by those figures in one year. Do you feel, and I accept the aspects of the figures and increased responsibilities and I understand the constraints but we have to bear that, I would actually say then do you consider both the February 17 and the February 18 budgets to have been safe?

Supplementary Answer

The answer to your question is the difference between the figure you are using and the figure I quoted is the 17/18 carry forward request total which is listed in the bottom line but one on there but if you wish to discuss that further I am very happy to continue that discussion outside this meeting.

In the final answer to your question yes from all the information I have seen and all the information I am aware of I do believe that the budget is safe.

6.7 Andy Croy asked the Executive Member for Regeneration the following question:

Question

Referring to Agenda Item 6 Page 34 of the Agenda states "*Managing the defects at Phoenix with the contractor continues to be hard work.....*"

Can the defects at Phoenix be quantified and why is managing them hard work?

Answer

I have got a lot of detail here which I am happy to share with you if it would help as it would take more than two minutes for me to go through all the detail.

Yes you are right the scale of defects at Phoenix Avenue can be quantified and has been an area of priority for WHL.

It has also been challenging because we had concerns that not all reports of defects from our tenants were being recorded by the contractors so we have got involved in that as well and that even when definitely recorded, little or no action was being taken by Hill. We have had some difficulty with this contractor in this regard.

WHL have also invested time in working directly with the tenants without getting involved in the detail so that no defects are missed by the contractor and we now have a weekly update session with them.

As a result all but three of the currently known about reported defects have appointments booked to have the issues attended to and WHL's ongoing monitoring suggest that all

defects reported by tenants are now effectively being recorded by the contractor. I will share with you a lot more of the detail.

Supplementary Question

Given the, what I am guessing, quite extensive list of defects was the Prime Minister told about them when she visited?

Supplementary Answer

Councillor Pauline Jorgensen gave the following answer:

The Prime Minister spent a lot of time talking to a lot of residents and I am sure that any residents that were upset about any defects would have taken the opportunity to share that with her. Generally what I saw when I talked to the residents was that they were delighted with their new houses and were really pleased to have somewhere decent to live that we have provided rather than the previous sofa surfing and spare bedrooms that they were using and I really think it is a really good development. We need to fix the issues but I am sure that the residents will have shared any issues they had directly with the Prime Minister. They certainly had plenty of time to talk to her.

The Leader of Council responded:

I would like to state that the number of defects are not huge bearing in mind the number of houses that have been provided on that estate. We will share the data with you. Just in case anyone was going away with a different impression.

6.8 Carl Doran had asked the Executive Member for Finance the following question:

Question

Referring to Agenda item 6 (page 34 of the agenda reports) the "Berry Brook Homes Limited (BBHL)" section reports this:

"The Berry Brook Board have been further considering the strategic direction of the company and developing their Business Plan. These discussions will be worked in to the current draft plan with a view to further refining this at an away day in mid-June."

Can I ask what the financial cost will be for this "away day"?

Answer

As Councillor Doran was unable to attend the meeting the following written answer was provided:

The financial cost of the away day to Berry Brook Homes will be £243, plus expenses for travel of around £80. This is a third of the cost of the venue hire including lunch and all refreshments, which between all three companies is £730.

7. SHAREHOLDERS' REPORT

(Councillors Norman Jorgensen, Pauline Jorgensen, Charles Margetts, Philip Mirfin and Stuart Munro declared personal interests in this item)

The Executive considered a report which provided the budget monitoring position for the month ending 31 March 2018 and the operational update for the period to 31 March 2018.

The Deputy Executive Member for Finance went through the report and was pleased to report that Wokingham Housing (WHL) had now handed over 125 new homes in the last

financial year to its sister housing companies Loddon and Berry Brook Homes which would generate a profit of £1.1m. In 2018/19 WHL were expected to hand over a further 60 new homes with a profit of just short of £1m.

Councillor Margetts reminded Members of why Optalis had been established and advised that today over £1m per annum costs had been reduced from the cost of the Council and the business had expanded from approximately £11-40m per annum following the merger with the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.

In addition Councillor Margetts drew Members' attention to the operational section of the report which set out the progress with the various sites.

The Leader of Council highlighted the extra care homes and key worker homes that had been provided by WHL and specifically mentioned the homes that were being provided for care leavers. Given that the housing companies had only been operating for a relatively short time Councillor Haitham Taylor felt that this was a tremendous achievement.

RESOLVED that:

- 1) the budget monitoring position for the month ending 31 March 2018 be noted:
- 2) the operational update for the period to 31 March 2018 be noted.

8. REVENUE MONITORING 2017/18 - OUTTURN

The Executive considered a report setting out the outturn position of the revenue budget and the level of balances in respect of the General Fund, Housing Revenue Account, Schools Block and the Authority's investment portfolio.

Whilst introducing the report the Deputy Executive Member for Finance highlighted the General Fund outturn position which showed an £814k overspend, which was actually £523k lower than the figure reported at the last quarter to the Executive. The Housing Revenue outturn position was just under budget. With regard to the Schools' Block outturn although this was overspent by £453k, which was as a result of high needs pressures, this was also more favourable than reported in January.

Councillor Margetts drew Members' attention to the budget carry forwards, as set out in Appendix B, which represented planned activities for 2018-19.

Councillor Mirfin queried whether any more detail was available on the demand affecting the adverse variance in People Services. Councillor Margetts reminded the meeting of the statutory costs that the Council had to bear in terms of social care provision as mentioned earlier in the meeting and the fact that demand was increasing rapidly which was something that was expected to continue.

RESOLVED that:

- 1) the outturn position of the revenue budget and the level of balances in respect of the General Fund, Housing Revenue Account, Schools' Block and the Authority's investment portfolio be noted:
- 2) the General Fund carry forward requests of £1,598,670, as set out in Appendix B to the report, be agreed.

9. CAPITAL OUTTURN 2017-18

The Executive considered a report setting out the Capital Budget Outturn for 2017-18 which included a number of carry forwards into future financial years.

The Executive Member for Finance reminded Members that there had been £89m of investment in the year on things such as highways infrastructure, regeneration, schools and affordable homes and highlighted that what was being delivered was five times as much as the Council delivered 4-5 years ago. The capital programme had also been delivered within budget with an actual underspend of £2.6m which showed that the Council had the ability to undertake such a large programme and keep control of the costs.

Councillor Margetts also highlighted the carry forwards for schemes into 2018/19, as listed in Table 2.3 of Appendix A which consisted of planned work which had been rolled forward.

The Leader of Council highlighted the largescale projects, including schools and country parks that were being undertaken and stated that unfortunately when delivering such large projects there was often disruption. Councillor Haitham Taylor asked residents to bear with the Council during these periods.

RESOLVED that:

- 1) the Capital Outturn, as set out in Appendix A to the report, be noted;
- 2) the carry forwards into future financial years, as set out in Appendix A to the report, be approved.

10. 21ST CENTURY COUNCIL - UPDATE

The Executive considered a report relating to the progress of the 21st Century Council Programme which was the change programme the aim of which was to transform the way that services were delivered and offer more options for residents to take up these services.

The Deputy Executive Member for Finance went through the report and highlighted a number of areas that had been delivered or were due to be delivered shortly including: online applications for school admissions and blue badges; a new planning search and planning map search facility which would give residents the opportunity to review an area and see related planning applications; an improved customer account facility which around 30k residents had already signed up for; and various online payment systems.

With regard to the Members' intranet site, which was currently at prototype stage, this was designed to place all the information Councillors might require in one area which should make Members more responsive and give a better service to residents.

Councillor Dolinski raised concerns about those residents who did not have access to or were uncomfortable using IT facilities and wanted to ensure that they wouldn't be disadvantaged. Councillor Margetts confirmed that the programme was not just about improving digital services but also about reviewing all the processes within the Council and streamlining them as much as possible. Residents were not obliged to use electronic facilities and there would still be a Customer Services Team to help people who required Council services. Councillor Margetts advised that from data he had recently seen call centre demand remained static but IT demand was increasing and with an increase in

customer services staff this meant that the Council had more capability to deal with more enquiries and respond quicker.

RESOLVED that the progress in implementing the 21st Century Council programme be noted.

This page is intentionally left blank

Decision made in the presence of:
Ian Bellinger, Category Manager, Growth and Delivery
Callum Wernham, Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist

INDIVIDUAL EXECUTIVE MEMBER DECISION RECORD SHEET IMD 2018/23
--

Title of the report	Revised National Planning Policy Framework consultation
----------------------------	--

DECISION MADE BY Leader of the Council – Charlotte Haitham Taylor
ACTION BY Interim Director of Environment - Josie Wragg
DECISION MADE ON 04 June 2018

Recommendation contained in the report

That the Leader of the Council agrees that Wokingham Borough Council submit the comments contained in Appendix B as this council's response to the governments draft revisions to the National Planning policy Framework.

Decision

That the Leader of the Council agrees that Wokingham Borough Council submit the comments contained in Appendix B as this council's response to the governments draft revisions to the National Planning policy Framework.

Reasons for Decision if different to recommendation

N/A

Alternative options considered and rejected at time of the decision

N/A

Summary of consultations undertaken

SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES	
Director – Corporate Services	None received.
Monitoring Officer	No specific comments.
Leader of the Council	None received.

Reasons why the report was deemed to have contained confidential or Exempt information (if applicable)

N/A

Any Conflict of interest declared by any Executive Member who is consulted by a Member which relates to the decision

None

Any dispensation granted by the Head of Paid Service in respect of any declared conflict of interest

None

Background papers

IEMD report

Appendix A: Summary of draft revisions

Appendix B: Recommended response

PUBLISHED ON: 4 June 2018

EFFECTIVE ON: 12 June 2018

CALL-IN PERIOD EXPIRES: 11 June 2018

Decision made in the presence of:
Ian Bellinger, Category Manager, Growth and Delivery
Callum Wernham, Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist

INDIVIDUAL EXECUTIVE MEMBER DECISION RECORD SHEET IMD 2018/26
--

Title of the report	Response from the Western Berkshire housing market area authorities to Slough Borough Council
----------------------------	--

DECISION MADE BY Leader of the Council – Charlotte Haitham Taylor
ACTION BY Interim Director of Environment - Josie Wragg
DECISION MADE ON 04 June 2018

Recommendation contained in the report

That the Leader of the Council agrees that Wokingham Borough Council agrees to the proposed joint response to Slough Borough Council as contained in Appendix A.

Decision

That the Leader of the Council agrees that Wokingham Borough Council agrees to the proposed joint response to Slough Borough Council as contained in Appendix A.

Reasons for Decision if different to recommendation

N/A

Alternative options considered and rejected at time of the decision

N/A

Summary of consultations undertaken

SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES	
Director – Corporate Services	No comments received.
Monitoring Officer	No specific comments.
Leader of the Council	No comments received.

Reasons why the report was deemed to have contained confidential or Exempt information (if applicable)

N/A

Any Conflict of interest declared by any Executive Member who is consulted by a Member which relates to the decision

None

Any dispensation granted by the Head of Paid Service in respect of any declared conflict of interest

None

Background papers

IEMD report

PUBLISHED ON: 4 June 2018

EFFECTIVE ON: 12 June 2018

CALL-IN PERIOD EXPIRES: 11 June 2018

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
SCHOOL ADMISSIONS FORUM
HELD ON 6 JUNE 2018 FROM 7.00 PM TO 8.45 PM**

Parent / Governor Representatives

Fiona Hayward St Teresa's Catholic Primary

Representatives from the Local Community

Patricia Cuss Early Years Forum

Schools Representatives

Ben Godber Bohunt School
Amanda Woodfin Bulmershe School
Sue Runciman Shinfield St Marys Junior School
Celia Thatcher Grazeley CE Aided Primary

Also Present

Luciane Bowker Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist
Piers Brunning Strategy and Commissioning (People and Place) Senior Specialist

9. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

Sue Runciman, Shinfield St Mary's Junior School Headteacher was appointed Vice-chairman of School Admissions Forum for the remainder of 2017/18 academic year.

In the absence of the Chairman Sue Runciman chaired the meeting.

10. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted from David Babb, Louisa Gurney and Councillors Prue Bray and Graham Howe.

11. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 29 January 2018 were confirmed as a correct record, subject to the amendment below and signed by the Chairman.

That the spelling of the Bohunt School Headteacher be corrected to read Ben Godber.

Matters arising

Online applications

Sue Runciman stated that she had asked children's centres to be available to help parents that needed assistance with online applications, and that they had agreed to do so.

Sue Runciman suggested that the term 'pack' should not be used in relation to online applications as this could be confusing to parents.

Sibling criteria

Ben Godber asked for clarification in respect to bullet point nine on page seven of the agenda which stated that the Local Authority had been asked to review the admission arrangements for Bohunt School in relation to the sibling criteria.

Piers Brunning, Strategic Commissioning (People and Place) Senior Specialist agreed to look into it and report back.

12. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

13. SCHOOL ADMISSIONS 2018 REPORT

The Forum considered the report which was set out in agenda pages 11-66.

Piers Brunning informed that the number of applications for primary school places had declined markedly (-3%) compared to 2017/18. This reflected the reduction in the number of children born to Wokingham resident mothers in the year 2013/14 feeding into the 2018 Reception cohort compared to earlier years. This was despite very high levels of house building in the borough bringing additional children in.

Piers Brunning stated that due to this decline every school cluster had capacity, something that had not been seen for some years. Overall 10% of Reception places were unfilled. This had helped ensure that a high proportion of first preferences were achieved and fewer children required home to school transport. This was positive for parents but challenging for the schools with lower numbers.

Piers Brunning explained that this decline in primary numbers was a national phenomenon and not exclusive to Wokingham.

Piers explained that the only area where surplus figures did not reach double figures was Woodley (9 surplus places). Woodley was an area that had seen high levels of housebuilding in recent years and current roll projections indicated further work may be required in this area.

Piers informed that secondary numbers had risen significantly (3% or 49 offers), this led to a 7% surplus capacity overall.

Piers stated that while both north and south planning areas had surplus capacity, in the north this was only 1.5% of capacity. However, there were significant levels of admissions of students from Reading from outside the cross-board designated areas, so this did not necessarily indicate that additional capacity was required in the near future. The southern area had significantly more surplus levels.

Piers pointed out that it was likely that Wokingham Borough would have had insufficient places on offer day without Bohunt School. The new school had brought in some students from outside the borough and Wokingham Borough resident students who would otherwise have attended out of borough schools, but it is unlikely the combined effect would have been 81 fewer applications (the deficit achieved by subtracting the number of allocations on offer day from the current total of Year 7 places, less Bohunt's 240 places).

Piers Brunning informed that the most affected secondary schools with unfilled places were Forest and Emmbrook.

During discussion of the item the following comments were made:

- It was expected that demand for primary school places would increase, especially in view of the high number of new house builds;
- Wokingham was a place that tended to attract young families.

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

14. DRAFT REPORT TO THE SCHOOLS ADJUDICATOR 2018

The Forum considered the Draft Report to the Office of the Schools Adjudicator (OSA) which was set out in agenda pages 17-32.

Piers Brunning stated that the Council was required to submit a report to the Schools Adjudicator every year by 30 June. The report contained in the agenda was based on a template issued by the OSA. The report enabled the OSA to get a snapshot view of the functioning of the admissions system and of the view of local authorities on what school admissions perceived to be key issues.

Piers Brunning invited the Forum to consider the current drafting, propose changes and contribute their views to areas where drafting had yet to commence.

Piers Brunning stated that some of the themes were repeats from previous years, but there seemed to be a particular interest this year in relation to Looked After Children (LAC) and previously LAC and children with Special Educational Needs (SEN) and disabilities.

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

- Sue Runciman was surprised with the definition of 'in-year' in the bottom of page 21. Piers Brunning agreed to question it with the OSA;
- Sue Runciman stated that she would be interested to read the final report and see the examples of good and bad practice;
- Piers Brunning stated that the report would be available online;
- Members of the Forum did not agree with the answers given to the questions in relation to the provision of education to children with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND). Members unanimously agreed that there were insufficient specialist places in the borough for children with disabilities;
- Amanda Woodfin stated that she had received 6 children in Year 7 with significant SEN, for whom there were no Educational Health and Care Plan (EHCP), who in her opinion should have had EHCPs, it was difficult to support these children. In response to a question Amanda stated that the primary settings where these children came from (which was cross border between Reading and Wokingham) were aware of their needs but perhaps did not have the resources to apply for an EHCP, especially in view of the fact that it was now very difficult to meet the threshold for obtaining an EHCP;
- Patricia Cuss stated that SEN children were often identified at Early Years settings, but it was a struggle to get the right level of support. In her opinion even when funding was granted, this was so minimal that it was not worth applying for;
- Sue Runciman stated that it was not cost effective for a primary schools to send a member of staff to a number of meetings knowing that it was very unlikely that they would obtain the support that was needed (unless the needs were severe), the threshold for getting an EHCP was very high and this was discouraging primary schools from applying;
- Patricia Cuss stated that SEN children were just about managed at Early Years stage because the staff levels at Early Years was higher, but 'just managing' was not good enough and she was very concerned that such children would struggle in the next phase of their education;

- Piers Brunning asked if the support needed was for diagnosis and placements and whether there was a role in getting additional support for getting children ready for the next phase of education;
- Sue Runciman stated that children who were known to have additional needs and could not access the normal curriculum, needed to be assessed differently, therefore within the settings there needed to be a provision of places that did not impact in the child's emotional needs as well as their ability to develop to be happy individuals. In the context they were in, inevitably these children would become unhappy and their behaviour would be likely to worsen as a result. They become unsettled and sad as they saw the growing gap between themselves and their peers;
- Sue Runciman stated that she had a child coming into her school whose needs meant that she should not be placed in a mainstream school, however there was no available place for this child in a specialist school within the borough; this meant her school would face significant challenges in being able to meet this child's needs;
- Amanda Woodfin stated that it was important to have early diagnosis and support;
- Patricia Cuss stated that she had a child in her establishment who she knew needed help. This child was on the waiting list to be assessed by Child Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS), however the waiting list was 18 months;
- Patricia Cuss pointed out that by not meeting the needs of SEN children at an early stage, the difficulties would increase as the child got older;
- Members agreed that more specialist spaces in schools such as Addington and Foundry were needed, and that in the absence of such places, settings such as Foundry College and Addington should be given extra support in enabling them to do outreach work with schools in the area, supporting them in meeting the needs of individuals for whom mainstream settings might not be appropriate;
- The Forum concluded, with concern, that children were being inappropriately placed in mainstream schools, there was insufficient support for schools and insufficient places in specialist schools;
- The Forum felt that this issue should be taken through the relevant channels to raise awareness of the problem. Luciane Bowker, Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist stated that Children's Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee (CSO&S) were going to invite CAMHS to one of their meetings, and that there may be an opportunity to pass on the Forum's concern to CSO&S; (*Subsequently Luciane Bowker advised that it may be more effective to submit a report outlining the concerns mentioned above to the Health and Wellbeing Board*)
- Patricia Cuss noted that in the past parents did not want their child labelled with a statement, however parents now seemed to want a label so that help could be provided.

In response to a question Piers Brunning stated that the Local Authority had sought legal advice in relation to the Published Admission Number (PAN) and found that PANs only apply for the normal year of entry (Year 7) and not for subsequent years. However, the expectation was that schools would admit up to their PAN in all subsequent year groups.

Ben Godber explained in response to part of the report that Bohunt School had grown but the Local Authority had failed to provide the additional funding that had been agreed. Bohunt had set a PAN of 180 and was due to be funded for 180, but when only 109 places were filled the Local Authority said that it was immoral to fund it for 180 bearing in mind the surplus spaces in other schools, and the school agreed to have its funding reduced to 150, subject to a review if the numbers grew rapidly. However, when the school became full the Local Authority refused to give the initially agreed guaranteed funding to 180, and that was the reason the school had refused to admit to 180. Piers Brunning agreed to amend

the answer in relation to PAN to take into account Ben Godber's comments and the context of the school.

In response to a question in relation to the advantages in the Local Authority coordinating in-year school admissions to Piers stated that if the Local Authority were not to coordinate admissions there was nothing stopping well informed parents from applying to several schools and holding on to places until they made a decision. This would disadvantage less informed parents.

The Forum expressed concern that the Fair Access Protocol (FAP) had not yet been agreed. The following comments were made in relation to FAP:

- Secondary schools were being consulted about FAP but it had not yet been agreed;
- Sue Runciman believed that the FAP for primaries also had not yet been agreed, although there had been some discussion about it and she believed that it was in hand;
- Amanda Woodfin stated that in the past there used to be regular FAP meetings, which sometimes discussed managed moves, she thought they were useful meetings;
- In response to a question Piers Brunning informed that school admissions was now under a generic customer services delivery team. This was as a result of recent re-organisation changes within the Council, there was no longer a dedicated school admissions team with a dedicated manager;
- Members were concerned that the generic customer services delivery team would not be experienced enough to pick out applications that should go to FAP;
- Piers Brunning pointed out that FAP only applied to a small number of children for whom a place could not be offered through the normal procedure, for example for twice excluded children;
- Amanda Woodfin was concerned that without a FAP schools might end up having to take on an unfair amount of challenging children;
- Piers Brunning explained that the parents' legal right to express a preference for a school was unconstrained;
- Piers Brunning stated that due to the recent re-structure within the Council it was not clear where the support for FAP was placed.

Piers Brunning stated that there had been an issue in the Earley area in that there had been insufficient places for children within their designated area. These children were disadvantaged in applying for other local schools because they were outside the designated areas of the next closest school. Piers asked the Forum for their views in respect of adding a criteria to address such cases. The general feeling of the Forum was that it would not be fair to add a criteria for these cases.

In response to a question Piers Brunning confirmed that there was no legal requirement for parents to inform/ register with the Local Authority in respect of home educating their children. Piers stated that education was compulsory but going to school was not. Members of the Forum were surprised with this information which did not seem to them to sit well with either Children Missing Education or Safeguarding policies. Luciane Bowker informed that the CSO&S had received a comprehensive report about Elective Home Education at its meeting on 23 January 2018 which was available in the Council's website.

Members pointed out that some parents used elective home education as a way to avoid permanent exclusion. Sue Runciman also pointed out that it was very challenging for schools when parents who had elected to home educate their children, finding themselves

unable to do so and becoming disillusioned with the process, decided to reintroduce them, or even introduce them for the first time, into schools who then have the challenge of ensuring accelerated progress for their child – this was another reason for the surprise expressed by professionals that a registry of home educated children did not exist.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) The report to the Schools Adjudicator 2018 would incorporate the views of School Admissions Forum mentioned above;
- 2) School Admissions Forum would put forward their concerns in relation to SEN provision in the borough through the appropriate channels.

15. WOKINGHAM BOROUGH DRAFT PRIMARY STRATEGY 2018 TO 2028

The Forum considered the Draft Primary Strategy report which was set out in agenda pages 33-66.

Piers Brunning informed that the consultation would be open online to primaries from 7 June 2018. The online version was slightly different from the report contained in the agenda.

Piers Brunning informed that this was a 10 year plan, taking into account the large scale development plans within the borough. Following the national programme of housing development, the Council had taken a decision to invest in large scale developments instead of a high number of smaller scale developments. The thought process behind it was that it was more effective to create the necessary infrastructure such as roads, schools and associated community facilities to a few large sites rather than having to do it to many small sites.

Piers Brunning stated that as part of the development plan two new primary schools had already been built: Floreat Montague Park (which had opened in 2016) and Shinfield West (due to open in September 2019). Two other primary schools were on course to open in 2020, one in the Matthews Green site and the other in the Arborfield site.

Piers Brunning stated that the impact of new homes was critical to the viability of new schools and neither the number of new homes nor the number of children who will live in them could be known when the decision to let building contracts was given. Therefore, the Council must have plans both for managing schools that are built too early and if additional capacity is required.

In response to a question Piers Brunning stated that the 10 year plan was based on the best evidence and guidance available, however it was expected that this would fluctuate within a band. Around two thirds of the number of houses that are planned to be built in the borough are to meet the additional housing needs that come of the household projection (from the Office of National Statistics) based on the population projection. The population projection for primary school children is flat, but despite that the number of new houses will increase, two thirds of those houses are expected to maintain the number of children in the borough

Piers explained that the projections took into account the life cycle of a household, which was considering when people tended to have children and when people tended to move out to downsize.

Piers Brunning stated that another consideration was the calculation based on affordability of houses for people working in Wokingham.

In response to a question Piers Brunning stated that birth data was used for more immediate plans, and the Office for National Statistics data were used to build the longer term plans. GPs data was part of the information received from the Office for National Statistics.

Fiona Hayward noted that some of the new houses were likely to be occupied by families splitting up who needed an additional house.

Piers Brunning stated that there was a degree of wariness in any projection because of many variables that could change the numbers.

Fiona Hayward asked Piers Brunning whether or not the data that could be made available by GP's surgeries could be helpful in refining projections and estimates; Piers Brunning replied that in the past this type of data had indeed been used, but the disadvantage to it was that families moving out of the area often did not inform their GPs that they were doing so, they simply re-registered with a new GP, rendering such data unreliable.

Piers Brunning informed that the Council was nearly ready to sign the contracts for the new primary schools to be built, there was a lengthy pre-contract process that had to happen. The new school in Matthews Green would include a community centre and the school in Arborfield would include a large all weather pitch which would also be used as a community facility.

Piers stated that the Arborfield School was going to be a two form entry primary school with the option to go into a third form entry if and when needed, with no fixed timetable. The Matthews Green School was going to be built as a single form entry initially, but it had planning consent for a second form entry.

Piers pointed out that Woodley had been identified as an area of risk, with 1000 new houses being built. Wokingham was known as an area that was attractive to young families looking to re-located to.

RESOLVED That the report be noted.

16. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

The dates for planned future meetings of the Forum to be noted:

- 12 November 2018
- 30 January 2019

Members asked to change the date of the meeting on Monday 12 November 2018 to Wednesday 14 November 2018. *Subsequently Luciane Bowker confirmed the change of date.*

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
AUDIT COMMITTEE
HELD ON 6 JUNE 2018 FROM 7.00 PM TO 8.30 PM**

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Chris Smith (Chairman), David Chopping (Vice-Chairman), Daniel Sargeant, Imogen Shepherd-DuBey and Oliver Whittle

Also Present

Madeleine Shopland, Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist
Julie Barker, Audit & Investigation Senior Specialist
Michael Bateman, Customer Relations Officer
Manjeet Gill, Interim Chief Executive
Andrew Moulton, Assistant Director Governance
Bob Watson, Lead Specialist - Finance
Helen Thompson, Ernst and Young
Malcolm Haines, Ernst and Young

1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN 2018/19

RESOLVED: That Councillor Chris Smith be elected Chairman for the 2018-19 municipal year.

2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIRMAN FOR 2018-19

RESOLVED: That Councillor David Chopping be appointed Vice Chairman for the 2018-19 municipal year

3. APOLOGIES

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Anthony Pollock.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 7 February 2018 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

5. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest submitted.

6. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no Public questions.

7. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

There were no Member questions.

8. EXTERNAL AUDIT PROGRESS REPORT

The Committee received an update on the progress of External Audit.

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

- The external audit would be undertaken between 25 June and 20 July. The results would be considered at the Committee's meeting on 25 July.
- Payroll had been tested for months 1 to 9.
- Members were assured that although it was a compressed timescale the 31 July deadline should be achieved.

RESOLVED: That the External Audit Progress Report be noted.

9. EXTERNAL AUDIT ANNUAL FEE 2018-19

The Committee was updated on the External Audit Fee for 2018-19.

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

- For the 2018/19 financial year PSAA had set the scale fee for each audited body that had opted into its national auditor appointment scheme. Following consultation on its Work Programme and Scale of Fees, PSAA had reduced the 2018/19 scale audit fee for all opted in bodies by 23% from the fees applicable for 2017/18.
- As the audit for 2017/18 had not yet been completed, the audit planning process for 2018/19 would continue as the year progressed. Fees would be reviewed and updated as necessary.
- The indicative audit fee would be billed in four quarterly instalments of £20,331.
- Members were informed that the appointment of an auditor to certify the Council's 2018/19 housing benefit subsidy claim was not covered by the PSAA appointment.
- Councillor Smith questioned whether Ernst & Young were confident that what needed to be delivered to sign off the opinion could be achieved for the reduced fee. Helen Thompson commented that it would be challenging but deliverable. Should significant issues arise with regards to value for money, further conversations would need to be had.

RESOLVED: That the External Audit Fee 2018-19 be noted.

10. UPDATE ON COMPLAINTS AND COMPLIMENTS

The Customer Relations Officer updated the Committee on complaints and compliments.

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

- The total number of corporate complaints had remained consistent with the last 2-3 financial years.
- Stage 1 complaints received this year had increased by 8.5% compared with 2016-17, but had decreased by 9.1% in comparison with 2015-16.
- Stage 2 complaints this year had remained consistent with the volumes received in the previous two financial years.
- It was noted that between April 2017 and March 2018, 89 Stage 1 corporate complaints had been received, of which 20 had been escalated to Stage 2. 30 Children's Services Social Care Complaints had been received, of which 9 had been dealt with at early resolution, 11 were received at Stage 1 and 2 were escalated to Stage 2. 11 had been out of scope.
- In response to a question from Councillor Shepherd-DuBey, the Customer Relations Officer explained how a complaint could be escalated from Stage 1 to Stage 2.
- Councillor Whittle asked what constituted a complaint. The Customer Relations Officer explained the difference between a 'service request' and a 'complaint.'
- It was confirmed that complaints from councillors were processed in the same way as those received from residents.
- The Committee asked who decided whether a matter was a complaint or not. The Customer Relations Officer commented that it could depend on how the enquiry

was received. He would liaise with the relevant service area. The Committee asked whether there was a policy document on how such decisions were made.

- Councillor Whittle questioned whether the number of complaints overall was decreasing. The Customer Relations Officer reiterated that the number of complaints compared to the total interactions, was very low.
- Members asked about the impact of the 21st century council programme and was informed that there was greater input from customer services in resolving issues as the first point of contact.
- It was noted that 10 complaints had been escalated to the Local Government Ombudsman/Housing Ombudsman. 1 had been upheld, which had related to a school transport appeal, 3 had been partially upheld and 6 had not been upheld.

RESOLVED: That the update on complaints and compliments be noted.

11. TREASURY MANAGEMENT OUTTURN 2017-18

The Lead Specialist Finance presented the Treasury Management Outturn Report 2017-18 which detailed the Treasury Management operations during 2017/18.

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

- It was noted that the Council had adhered to all the agreed prudential indicators during 2017/18.
- The investment return for 2017/18 was £1.3m. The Lead Specialist Finance explained that the Council tended to restrict external investments to other local authorities. The security of the investment was of key importance.
- Councillor Whittle asked why an investment broker was used for external investments when officers could go directly to those authorities with who they may have developed a relationship who may be willing to lend. The Lead Specialist Finance commented that officers could potentially contact other known local authorities regarding investments and if this was unsuccessful, make use of a broker. The broker fee tended to be with the lending authority.
- Councillor Chopping asked about short term loans and the council owned companies.

RESOLVED: That

- 1) the Treasury Management Outturn Report 2017-18 be noted;
- 2) the actual 2017/18 prudential indicators within the report, be noted;
- 3) the report be recommended to Council for approval.

12. ANNUAL GOVERNANCE STATEMENT 2017/18

Members received the Annual Governance Statement 2017-18.

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

- The Annual Governance Statement had been produced by the Corporate Leadership Team following consideration of a number of Management Assurance Statements produced by the Directors and some Assistant Directors. These had been signed by the relevant Director and Executive Lead Member to provide accountability and assurance to the Chief Executive and Leader of the Council.

- It had been concluded that the Council's governance arrangements were fit for purpose.
- A number of exceptions had been identified. An action plan around these exceptions had been produced. Members requested an update report on the exceptions identified, in six months' time.
- Councillor Whittle commented that reference should be made to the impact on budget and resources that increasing demand in adult and children's services would have. The Assistant Director Governance commented that the Annual Governance Statement had been produced at a certain point in time. He agreed to feed the Committee's proposal back to the Corporate Leadership Team.

RESOLVED: That the Annual Governance Statement be approved prior to its inclusion in the final Statement of Accounts subject to reference being made to increasing costs in People Services as a result of increasing service demand.

13. UPDATE ON INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL REPORTING STANDARD 15

The Committee was updated on International Financial Reporting Standard 15 (IFRS 15) by the Lead Specialist Finance.

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

- IFRS 15 provided guidance on accounting for revenue from contracts with customers.
- The Lead Specialist Finance advised that there would be some impact to the Council with regards to disclosures and contracts. However, largescale changes were not anticipated for local authorities.
- Members were informed that there would be an item regarding standards not yet adopted within the Statement of Accounts.
- An update on accounting policies would be taken to the Committee's February 2019 meeting.

RESOLVED: That the update on International Financial Reporting Standard 15 be noted.

14. EXTERNAL QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF CONFORMANCE TO THE PUBLIC SECTOR INTERNAL AUDIT STANDARDS

The Committee considered a report on the External Quality Assessment of Conformance to the Public Sector Internal Audit Standards.

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

- The Shared Internal Audit Service had been created in 2014. A self-assessment was completed annually.
- The Public Sector Internal Audit Standards (PSIAS) required periodic self-assessments and an assessment by an external person at least every five years.
- The overall conclusion had been that the service generally conformed to the requirements of PSIAS and the Local Government Application Note.
- The Committee noted the summary of observations, recommendations and suggestions. There had been one incident of non-compliance around the Internal Audit Charter. An updated Charter would be presented at the next Committee meeting. Members felt that it was reassuring that only one 'red' had been identified.
- Members thanked the Audit and Investigation Senior Specialist and the team for their hard work.

- The Assistant Director Governance stated that the assessment would assist in the service winning further external business.
- An action plan had been produced. Councillor Smith commented that many of the proposed completion dates were July and August. He requested an update on the completion of the actions at the November committee meeting.
- Councillor Whittle questioned whether the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead Council Audit Committee would also receive the report and was informed that they would.

RESOLVED: That the results of the external assessment of the Shared Audit and Investigations against the Public Sector Internal Audit Standards, be noted.

15. INTERNAL AUDIT OF 21ST CENTURY COUNCIL PROGRAMME

The Committee was updated on the Internal Audit of the 21st Century Council Programme.

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

- The Assistant Director Governance commented that Internal Audit work had been conducted on various aspects of the 21st century council programme; governance, risk management, finance and the IT work stream programme management. This had been part of a rolling programme of audit work that would continue over the lifetime of the project.
- The Executive and Overview and Scrutiny Committees also monitored the progress of the 21st century council programme.
- An audit opinion category 2 – Substantially Complete and Generally Effective (the second highest of the four Audit Opinions) had been assigned as a result of the audit review.
- Members asked that the results of the audit be sent to the relevant Executive Member and Deputy Executive Member if not already done so.

RESOLVED: That the internal audit memorandum summarising the conclusion from the audit of the 21st Century Council programme be noted.

16. CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

The Interim Chief Executive presented the Corporate Risk Register.

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

- The Interim Chief Executive indicated that the picture was broadly the same as when she had last updated the Committee.
- Members were advised that there were risks around financial constraints.
- The 21st century council programme was discussed. Lessons had been and continued to be learnt as the programme progressed.
- With regards to People Services, demand for children and adult services was greatly increasing. This was a national problem.
- Discussions regarding efficiencies were being had with partners.
- Members questioned how the risk level was decided. The Assistant Director Governance indicated that within each Directorate there was a Directorate Risk Register which was agreed by the relevant Director in consultation with the relevant Assistant Directors and Executive Member. The Corporate Risk Register was managed by the Corporate Leadership Team in conjunction with the Executive Members.

- The Assistant Director Governance explained how risks were identified.
- The Interim Chief Executive indicated that the Corporate Risk Register would be reviewed. The Committee asked that training on risk management be provided prior to a future meeting. The Chairman requested a timetable for the review of the risk register and that the Committee be able to comment on the refreshed Corporate Risk Register. An additional committee meeting would be arranged if required.

RESOLVED: That the risks and mitigating actions of the Council's Corporate Risk Register as set out in the report, be noted.

17. ANNUAL REPORT 2017/18 - SHARED AUDIT & INVESTIGATION SERVICES

The Committee received the Annual Report 2017/18 – Shared Audit and Investigation Services.

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

- The report detailed the work of the team during 2017/18 which had also been reported on a quarterly basis.
- During the year Internal Audit had undertaken audits of key financial systems in order to complement the work of External Audit.
- The Assistant Director Governance advised Members that approximately 80% of the approved 2017-18 Internal Audit Plan had been completed and that the work outstanding was predominantly complete.
- Progress against the plan had been affected by an officer being seconded to the 21st Century Council programme and another resulting vacancy from the end of quarter one.
- Savings achieved by Investigations were noted.
- The Committee discussed the Debtor and Housing Rents audits. It was noted that a lot of work was being undertaken in these areas to make improvements, the results of which the Committee would be informed of.
- With regards to council tax collection, Councillor Whittle proposed that less time be given before non-payment was chased up.
- The Lead Specialist Finance commented that sundry debtors were now contacting those with outstanding payments by phone as well as by letter.

RESOLVED: That the 2017/18 Shared Audit and investigation Service Annual Report be noted.

18. FORWARD PROGRAMME 2018-19

The Committee considered the Forward Programme 2018-19.

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

- The Internal Audit Charter would be taken to the Committee's July meeting.
- A number of items would be taken to the Committee's November meeting:
 - Corporate Risk Register training and review;
 - Update on International Financial Reporting Standard 15;
 - Update on progress made against the exceptions identified within the Annual Governance Statement;

- Update on progress made against actions identified within the External Audit Quality Assessment of Conformance to the Public Sector Internal Audit Standards action plan.
- Changes to accounting policies would be presented at the Committee's February meeting.

RESOLVED: That the forward programme be noted.

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD ON 13 JUNE 2018 FROM 7.00 PM TO 8.40 PM**

Committee Members Present

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

Councillors Present and Speaking

Councillors: John Halsall and Barrie Patman

Officers Present

Neil Allen, Senior Lawyer
Connor Corrigan, Service Manager, SDL Planning Delivery
Chris Easton, Service Manager - Highways Development
Callum Wernham, Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist

Case Officers Present

Mark Croucher
Christopher Howard
Kayleigh Mansfield

1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN FOR 2018/19 MUNICIPAL YEAR

RESOLVED: That Councillor Tim Holton be elected Chairman of the Planning Committee for the 2018/19 Municipal Year.

Councillor Holton personally thanked Councillor Philip Houldsworth for his service on the Planning Committee.

Councillor Holton personally thanked Councillor John Kaiser for his service as Vice Chairman in the previous two years' Planning Committee.

2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIRMAN FOR THE 2018/19 MUNICIPAL YEAR.

RESOLVED: That Councillor Chris Bowring be appointed Vice Chairman of the Planning Committee for the 2018/19 Municipal Year.

3. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 9 May 2018 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

5. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

6. APPLICATIONS TO BE DEFERRED AND WITHDRAWN ITEMS

No applications were recommended for deferral, or withdrawn.

**7. APPLICATION NO 180758 - SPECIALIST HOUSING SITE 1 LOCAL CENTRE
LAND WEST OF SHINFIELD WEST OF HYDE END ROAD & HOLLOW LANE
SOUTH OF CHURCH LANE, SHINFIELD**

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in Agenda pages 9 to 46.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- a correction to the summary section of the report, the site was to the left of Hollow Lane;
- label Informatives below condition 8;
- paragraph 23 had an error in numbering, re number changed to 24 and numbered up subsequent paragraphs;
- paragraph 50, the flats would meet internal space standards;
- paragraph 51, the balconies would range from a minimum of 9m² to 20m².

Elizabeth Fowler, Agent, spoke in favour of the application. She stated that this application was a reserved matter and that application 180757 was also brought to the Committee so that they could be considered together. She added that the facility would provide 80 extra care units for residents over 55 years of age whom were in need of some amount of care. She stated that there would be communal facilities for residents and that the facility would be adaptable in terms of care. Elizabeth added that resident's spouses could move in as at any time.

Barrie Patman, Ward Member, spoke in objection to the application. He stated that he was representing all of Shinfield South's ward Members'. He stated that this was to be a flagship development in a prime real estate area which would be a showcase for Shinfield South and which needed to be in keeping with the existing surroundings. He felt that the four storey design was not in keeping with the surrounding area and that the external appearance of the property did not stand out as a showcase development should. He stated that he had concerns with the appearance of the balconies. He added his sympathy with the Parish council and their concerns.

Christopher Howard, Case Officer, clarified a number of Member concerns. He stated that the proposed development was no higher than the approved parameters. He added that the extra space provided by the fourth storey was necessary to ensure the care provider has the minimum amount of space and bedrooms to operate the facility at a profit. He continued by stating that the four storey design was designed to differentiate the new building with the adjacent properties. . He stated that the development would act as an 'entrance' to the new village centre and that the balconies provided useful and necessary outdoor space for the residents and broke up the mass of the building.

In response to Member queries regarding the lack of sprinkler's in the proposed design Connor Corrigan, Service Manager – SDL Planning Delivery, clarified that this was a building regulation consideration rather than a planning issue.

Chris Easton, Service Manager – Highways Development, clarified a number of concerns from Members' regarding car parking. He stated that the proposed car parking arrangement complied with the Council's policies. He added that a car parking management strategy would be in place at the facility. In response to a query regarding disabled car parking, Chris Easton clarified that five spaces had been marked up for disabled parking and the management of the car park could mark up further spaces as and

when needed. Whilst spaces are currently shown as marked up as disabled spaces it is for the facility to manage and as such until disabled spaces are required, it would be advisable to not mark any up as they may not be used and would reduce the level of available parking on site for all users.

A number of Members' voiced their concerns about the appearance of the building. They felt that the design looked 'dated' and did not stand out as a showcase design. Christopher Howard stated that this concern was subjective. Councillor Bowring added that an appeal had rejected a refusal based on appearance in the past.

RESOLVED: That application 180758 be approved subject to the conditions set out in Agenda pages 11 to 14.

8. APPLICATION NO 180757 - SPECIALIST HOUSING SITE (SOUTH) LOCAL CENTRE LAND WEST OF SHINFIELD WEST OF HYDE END ROAD & HOLLOW LANE SOUTH OF CHURCH LANE, SHINFIELD

The Committee received and reviewed about this application, set out in Agenda pages 47 to 86.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- a correction to the summary section of the report, the site was to the west of Hollow Lane;
- an amendment to the list of plans to include plan number TDA.2368.01, Rev B;
- removal of condition 6 (boundary treatment) as stated in the report as this detail had been provided;
- the travel plan being corrected to condition 5 and remaining conditions numbered up accordingly.

Elizabeth Fowler, Agent, spoke in favour of the application. She stated that this application was more akin to a traditional care home and would accommodate 4 wings with 17 residents in each. She added that each bedroom would provide an en suite wet room. She stated that the facility would have separate communal areas for each wing in addition to larger communal areas.

Barrie Patman, Ward Member, spoke in objection to the application. He stated that he was concerned over the appearance of the proposed development as it would be in a prime location and he felt that its design did not stand out from its surroundings. He stated concerns regarding the elevation of the property.

Christopher Howard, Case Officer, clarified that there would be storage facilities for 3 mobility scooters and that the property would back on to the extra care facility from two storeys to three storeys.

Connor Corrigan, Service Manager – SDL Planning Delivery, answered a number of Member queries regarding pedestrian access to the nearby medical centre. He stated that this was difficult to achieve as this would require the agreement of a third party land owner, however there would be consultation with the surgery and other land owners to try and secure this access.

A number of Members' raised concerns about the lack of a sprinkler system in the proposed development. Connor Corrigan clarified that this was a building regulation consideration rather than a planning issue.

Christopher Howard clarified a query from Councillor Jarvis regarding the number of rooms. Christopher stated that the third floor of the development would be for staff use only, rather than for the residents use.

Councillor Holton queried the allocation of 7 visitor car parking bays. Chris Easton, Service Manager – Highways Development, stated that the overall parking provision was in line with the use proposed on site and that the total parking provision would be managed by the facility and therefore subject to Travel Planning and unallocated parking, there would be sufficient level of parking available this was deemed and acceptable number by Officers.

RESOLVED: That application 180757 be approved subject to the conditions set out in Agenda pages 49 to 52.

9. APPLICATION NO 170994 - POLICE HOUSE SCHOOL HILL, WARGRAVE

The Committee received and reviewed a report set out in Agenda pages 87 to 107.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- two additional conditions to be added to the application, Site Levels and Cycle Parking – details required;
- condition 13 (Sustainable Drainage) was to be replaced with a condition regarding Drainage Details, which would assist preventing increased flood risk from surface water run off;
- a clarification to the total number of objections received;
- a clarification that the finished heights of the proposed dwellings be measured at approximately 8.2 metres and that both dwellings would benefit from private rear garden depths of 11 metres.

Paula Wallace, Neighbour, spoke in objection to the application. Paula stated that she made it 38 objections to the application rather than the 37 stated in the Members' Update. She stated that the application was based on a notoriously dangerous junction which had limited visibility (due to roadside vegetation and traffic) and was already confusing for road users. She added that The Piggott Senior School walk past the junction as it was the only safe walking route (as school lane was unsafe to walk). Paula felt that this additional development would only increase the danger associated with the junction. She added that she had personally seen two children knocked off of their bikes and had a pram knocked out of her hand. She stated that the Council had made efforts to make Braybrooke road safer, with a new pavement present outside her house.

Paul Woods, Applicant, spoke in favour of the application. He stated that all of the planning Officer's recommendations had been taken on board and applied to this application. He added that the proposed development was acceptable.

John Halsall, Ward Member, spoke in objection to the application. He stated that Paula Wallace had summarized many of the concerns associated with this application. He stated that this application had gone through three separate application numbers, and had believed that this particular application number had ceased previously. He added that this

application was close to a hazardous corner and he was of the opinion that highways had not rigorously assessed the risks that this application would add to.

Chris Easton, Service Manager – Highways Development, clarified a number of Member queries. He stated that there had been no accidents reported on the official Police databases that Highways reviews when assessing proposed development could use. He added that if accidents do happen they residents should be encouraged to report accidents to the police so that they would appear on the official databases. He stated that approximately 40 to 50 metres of double yellow lines were present within the vicinity of around the junction.

Members' sought clarification regarding enforcement of parking beyond the double yellow lines. Chris Easton stated that this was not feasibly enforceable as there are no parking restriction in place in these areas.

RESOLVED: That application 170994 be approved subject to the conditions set out in Agenda pages 88 to 92, two additional conditions as detailed in the Members' Update and the replacement of condition 13 as detailed in the Members' Update.

10. APPLICATION NO 173726 - BACLOMBE NURSERIES, SWALLOWFIELD

The Committee received and reviewed a report set out in Agenda pages 109 to 137.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included an additional condition (18) which would assist in protecting the amenity of neighbouring residents.

Neil Davis, Agent, spoke in favour of the application. He stated that there had been 5 letters in support of the application including one from the Parish Council. He added that the application would include an ecological enhanced area, a new pond and various plants to be placed around the development. He added that the proposed development posed no amenity concerns.

Garth Pearce, Neighbour, spoke in favour of the application. He stated that all of the local residents supported the application and that the owner had consulted with local residents and had taken their thoughts on board. He stated that this land had over 25 years of obscure schemes, including 3 planning inquiries that had been found in favour of rejecting the application. He stated that he and other local residents were pleased to have a developer whom had proposed a reasonable scheme and had consulted with residents and the local authority throughout the planning process.

Councillor Ross sought clarification regarding the enhancement area land. Mark Croucher, Case Officer, stated that the land was part of an ecological management plan and that the section 106 agreement would add security to that.

In response to a Member query regarding a gate at the property, Mark Croucher stated that there had been no proposals for a gate to be installed at the development.

RESOLVED: That application 173726 be approved subject to the conditions set out in Agenda pages 110 to 116, an additional condition 18 as detailed in the Members' Update and a S106 legal agreement.

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
SPECIAL COUNCIL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
HELD ON 13 JUNE 2018 FROM 6.00 PM TO 6.07 PM**

Committee Members Present

Councillors: John Kaiser (Chairman), Bill Soane (Vice-Chairman), Lindsay Ferris, Charlotte Haitham Taylor and Julian McGhee-Sumner

Officers Present

Manjeet Gill, Chief Executive
Anne Hunter, Democratic and Electoral Services Lead Specialist

1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

Councillor John Kaiser was elected Chairman of the Special Council Executive Committee for the 2018/19 Municipal Year.

2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIRMAN

Councillor Bill Soane was appointed Vice Chairman of the Special Council Executive Committee for the 2018/19 Municipal Year.

3. APOLOGIES

An apology for absence was submitted from Councillor Simon Weeks.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 27 January 2017 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

5. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest received.

6. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no public questions received.

7. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

There were no Member questions received.

8. APPOINTMENT OF STATUTORY DIRECTOR OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES AND DIRECTOR OF ADULT SOCIAL SERVICES

The Committee considered the appointment of Lisa Humphreys to the statutory role of Director of Children's Services and Martin Sloan to the statutory role of Director of Adult Social Services on an interim basis following the departure of the Director of People's Services who had previously undertaken both these roles. It was noted that Council was required to appoint to these two statutory roles.

Manjeet Gill advised the Committee that the appointments were being proposed on an interim basis and that Personnel Board would be considering a more permanent arrangement at its meeting on 19 June 2018.

RESOLVED: That Lisa Humphreys be appointed to the statutory role of Director of Children's Services and Martin Sloan to the statutory role of Director of Adult Social Services on an interim basis with immediate effect.

This page is intentionally left blank

Decision made in the presence of:
 Andrew Kupusarevic, Interim Service Manager – Financial Assessments
 Madeleine Shopland, Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist

**INDIVIDUAL EXECUTIVE MEMBER
 DECISION RECORD SHEET
 IMD 2018/24**

Title of the report	Discretionary Housing Payment Policy 2018/2019
----------------------------	---

DECISION MADE BY Executive Member for Finance and Corporate Resources - Julian McGhee-Sumner
ACTION BY Director of Corporate Services - Graham Ebers
DECISION MADE ON 14 June 2018

Recommendation contained in the report

That the Executive Member for Finance and Corporate Resources approve the draft policy amendments to be implemented from April 2018.

Decision

That the Executive Member for Finance and Corporate Resources approve the draft policy amendments to be implemented from April 2018.

Reasons for Decision if different to recommendation

N/A

Alternative options considered and rejected at time of the decision

N/A

Summary of consultations undertaken

SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES	
Director – Corporate Services	No major changes to policy that required consultation. Changes include updating of financial years, finances/funding Director and Head of Service have reviewed policy changes and had the opportunity to comment on.
Monitoring Officer	No comments received
Leader of the Council	No comments received

Reasons why the report was deemed to have contained confidential or Exempt information (if applicable)

N/A

Any Conflict of interest declared by any Executive Member who is consulted by a Member which relates to the decision

None

Any dispensation granted by the Head of Paid Service in respect of any declared conflict of interest

None

Background papers

DWP DHP Guidance Manual Updated March 2018;
DWP Circular S1/2018;
Revised WBC DHP Policy;
EIA;

PUBLISHED ON: 15 June 2018

EFFECTIVE ON: 25 June 2018

CALL-IN PERIOD EXPIRES: 22 June 2018

Decision made in the presence of:
 Andrew Kupusarevic, Interim Service Manager – Financial Assessments
 Madeleine Shopland, Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist

**INDIVIDUAL EXECUTIVE MEMBER
 DECISION RECORD SHEET
 IMD 2018/25**

Title of the report	Local Welfare Provision Policy 2018 / 2019
----------------------------	---

DECISION MADE BY Executive Member for Finance and Corporate Resources - Julian McGhee-Sumner
ACTION BY Director of Corporate Services - Graham Ebers
DECISION MADE ON 14 June 2018

Recommendation contained in the report

That the Executive Member for Finance and Corporate Resources approve the draft policy amendments to be implemented from April 2018.

Decision

That the Executive Member for Finance and Corporate Resources approve the draft policy amendments to be implemented from April 2018.

Reasons for Decision if different to recommendation

N/A

Alternative options considered and rejected at time of the decision

N/A

Summary of consultations undertaken

SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES	
Director – Corporate Services	No major changes to policy that required consultation. Changes include updating of financial years, finances/funding Director and Head of Service have reviewed policy changes and had the opportunity to comment on.
Monitoring Officer	No comments received
Leader of the Council	No comments received

Reasons why the report was deemed to have contained confidential or Exempt information (if applicable)

N/A

Any Conflict of interest declared by any Executive Member who is consulted by a Member which relates to the decision

None

Any dispensation granted by the Head of Paid Service in respect of any declared conflict of interest

None

Background papers

Local Welfare Provision Review (November 2014);
WBC's revised LWP policy;
EIA;

PUBLISHED ON: 15 June 2018

EFFECTIVE ON: 25 June 2018

CALL-IN PERIOD EXPIRES: 22 June 2018

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD
HELD ON 14 JUNE 2018 FROM 5.00 PM TO 7.05 PM**

Present

Richard Dolinski	Executive Member for Adult Social Care
Darrell Gale	Acting Strategic Director of Public Health for Berkshire
Charlotte Haitham Taylor	Leader of the Council
David Hare	Opposition Member
Clare Rebbeck	Voluntary Sector and Place and Community Partnership Representative
Katie Summers	Director of Operations, Berkshire West CCG
Martin Sloan	Assistant Director Adult Services
Jim Stockley (substituting Nick Campbell- White)	Healthwatch Wokingham
Graham Ebers (substituting Shaun Virtue)	Director Corporate Services

Also Present:

Madeleine Shopland	Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist
Manjeet Gill	Interim Chief Executive
Julie Hotchkiss	Interim Consultant in Public Health
Nicola Strudley	Healthwatch Wokingham
Chrisa Tsiarigli	Public Health Intelligence Specialist
Rhian Warner	Better Care Fund Programme Manager
Rosie Rowe	Programme Director Bicester Healthy New Town Programme

1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN 2018-19

RESOLVED: That Councillor Richard Dolinski be elected Chairman of the Health and Wellbeing Board for the 2018-19 municipal year.

2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIRMAN

RESOLVED: That Dr Debbie Milligan be elected Vice Chairman of the Health and Wellbeing Board for the 2018-19 municipal year.

3. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted from Nick Campbell-White, Councillor Pauline Helliard Symons, Lisa Humphreys, Dr Debbie Milligan and Dr Cathy Winfield.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Board held on 5 April 2018 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

5. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

6. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

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

6.1 Bill Luck had asked the Chairman of the Health and Wellbeing Board the following question. Due to his inability to attend the following written answer was provided:

Question

With the concerns being expressed by local residents about delays in getting to see a doctor, are there sufficient numbers of doctors in general practice in the Borough to serve all the current residents and are there any new surgeries planned to serve the significant new development in the Borough, or any shortfall in the current provision, and, if so, are any CIL funds earmarked for such provision?

Answer

Some surgeries in Wokingham are carrying GP vacancies but on the whole the Borough has sufficient numbers of doctors to serve its population. There is a national shortage of GPs and as such NHS England is looking to recruit GPs from overseas. BW CCG has submitted a bid to be part of this programme, which if successful, will see four additional GPs working in Wokingham by the end of 2019. Other initiatives are also in place to support GP recruitment and retention. Alongside these, practices are also increasingly working with a more diverse clinical workforce including pharmacists and paramedics.

A number of surgeries have recently been given NHS funding to enable them to extend their existing premises to provide additional clinical capacity in response to the planned housing developments. These are: Finchampstead, Swallowfield, Brookside and Chalfont. The CCG continues to work with Wokingham Borough Council to plan for future housing growth with a view to funding being made available to support health care provision. Section 106 monies have been set aside for this purpose.

There are no plans to use Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) for healthcare facilities.

7. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

There were no Member questions.

8. HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD REFRESH

The Director Corporate Services presented the Health and Wellbeing Board Refresh.

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

- A Health and Wellbeing Board Manager had been appointed and would be starting on 25 June.
- With regards to training the Local Government Association Self-assessment process "Stepping up to the place: Facilitated integration workshop" had started. An initial scoping call had taken place with LGA representatives and further calls would take places calls with key individuals. A half-day workshop would be held on 2 July 2018.
- A separate Berkshire West wide workshop, including the Health and Wellbeing Boards of West Berkshire and Reading Councils, was being planned by Julie Hotchkiss and Dr Cathy Winfield, and a facilitator recommended by the LGA. The date would most likely be in September. Councillor Haitham Taylor asked that the weeks of the political party conferences be avoided.

- The Board discussed public engagement and branding. Councillor Hare asked about the sub partnerships which fed into the Health and Wellbeing Board; the Community Safety Partnership was co-chaired by Graham Ebers and Superintendent Shaun Virtue, the Children and Young People’s Partnership was chaired by Lisa Humphreys, Assistant Director Children’s Services, Clare Rebbeck chaired the Place and Community Partnership and the Wokingham Leaders Partnership Board was co-chaired by Martin Sloan and Katie Summers.
- Katie Summers, Director Operations Wokingham, NHS Berkshire West CCG, stated that West Berkshire Health and Wellbeing Board had invited a planning officer to participate in the Health and Wellbeing Board in order to better connect the health and planning processes. She suggested that similar be investigated for the Wokingham Health and Wellbeing Board.
- Graham Ebers outlined which Officers and Members had been allocated which specific priorities to progress.

RESOLVED: That the actions to refresh the Health and Wellbeing Board Agenda be supported and noted.

9. BICESTER HEALTHY NEW TOWN PRESENTATION

Rosie Rowe, Programme Director Bicester Healthy New Town Programme, provided a presentation on the Bicester Healthy New Town programme.

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

- Bicester had a population of approximately 39,000. This was set to double by 2031.
- The programme was about growth and the challenges and opportunities that this brought. It was an opportunity to promote the health and wellbeing of the whole local population.
- The programme promoted behaviour change; becoming more active; being good neighbours; and eating healthily. It was appreciated that sustaining individual behaviour change could be difficult.
- A systems based approach and partnership was vital. Board members were informed of an event which a number of partners participated in. Talks had been given around exercise for diabetics, health walks and the Bicester Healthy New Town Programme, amongst other topics. After the event 27% of attendees had signed up for some form of structured education and support.
- The programme’s key objectives had been consulted on with experts and residents and were as follows:
 - To increase the number of children and adults who are physically active and a healthy weight.
 - To reduce the number of people who feel socially isolated or lonely in order to improve their mental wellbeing.
- There were three programme workstreams:
 - Bicester’s built environment - making best use of the built environment to encourage healthy living.
Community Activation – enabling local people to live healthier lives, with the support of local community groups, families and schools, and employers.
 - Health and care services -delivering new models of care that are focused on prevention and care closer to home which minimises hospital based care.
- Board members were informed that the programme had taken a year to set up and had been just over a year in delivery.

- The built environment was discussed. The relationship between health colleagues and planners had improved and there was a better understanding of each other's needs and constraints.
- The built environment could help encourage an active lifestyle. Digital innovations were also helping to address social isolation. Three safe and accessible 5km health routes had been marked out by a blue line in the old part of town. This encouraged people to meet up and walk the 'Bicester Blue Line.'
- On the Bicester West Health Route, the daily average footfall prior to installation of the Health Route was 557 people: this had increased to 708, a 27% increase.
- Work was being carried out with community groups, leisure providers, schools and businesses, to encourage the use of walking routes and cycle paths. There were a lot of micro businesses in the area.
- New models of care enabled through use of technology were being developed and tested with Bicester acting as a 'demonstrator site.'
- Rosie Rowe outlined the benefits of healthy place making at the 2 year point, including the fact that 2,000 primary school now ran a mile a day at school and 469 more people were participating in health walks.
- Healthy place making required a whole systems approach; policy, physical environment, organisations and institutions, social environment and the individual. It was important to build into Integrated Care Systems.
- Councillor Haitham Taylor asked how much resources had gone into the programme prior to its start. Rosie Rowe commented that the Healthy New Town programme was an NHS England funded demonstrator programme. Ten sites had been selected across the country. It was three year programme and funding had been provided from 2016. Approximately £900,000 would be provided over the three years. Rosie Rowe felt that results could potentially be achieved with approximately £150,000 per year. She went on to emphasise that it was important to have the dedicated resources in place to engage people and to make the necessary connections.

RESOLVED: That the Bicester Healthy New Town programme presentation be noted.

10. DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH'S ANNUAL REPORT 2018

The Board received the Director of Public Health's Annual Report for 2018.

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

- It was a statutory requirement of the Director of Public Health to produce an annual report.
- The 2018 report focused on creating the right environment for health.
- The report, 'Creating the Right Environments for Health' recommended the following;
 - Local authorities and other agencies should continue to encourage community initiatives that make the most of natural space available, with the aim of improving mental health, increasing physical activity and strengthening communities.
 - Existing green space should be improved and any new developments should include high quality green spaces. The use of professional design and arrangements to ensure the ongoing management of natural environments should be considered if spaces are to be sustainable.
 - Opportunities to increase active transport should be considered when designing new green spaces and in the improvement of existing space.

- Planning guidance for new developments should specifically consider the use of green and blue space to improve the health and wellbeing of residents and others using the space.
- Local Authorities and their public health teams should foster new relationships with organisations aiming to improve the natural environment and its use.
- Councillor Haitham Taylor asked how the document would remain live. Darrell Gale, Acting Strategic Director Public Health Berkshire, commented that next year's report would include an update on the progression of the recommendations. The report would be circulated widely to schools, the voluntary sector and GP surgeries amongst others.
- Katie Summers commented that a group should be established to progress the report. Clare Rebbeck stated that this was something which the Place and Community Partnership could assist with.

RESOLVED: That the Board note the Director Public Health Annual Report and its conclusions and share it widely within their respective organisations and local communities.

11. JOINT STRATEGIC NEEDS ASSESSMENT (JSNA) 2018 UPDATE

Chrisa Tsiarigli, Public Health Intelligence Specialist and Julie Hotchkiss, Interim Consultant in Public Health presented the draft Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) 2018 updates.

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

- The document represented a refresh of the current JSNA. It was split into 6 chapters, starting with the Borough profile for general background. The next 4 chapters were arranged across the life course. The final chapter, 'People and Places' provided information on the wider determinants of health and intelligence on specific groups of people.
- A blank matrix had been circulated which Board members were encouraged to complete and return to Public Health, identifying key services, key service achievements, key service gaps and future recommendations.
- Chrisa Tsiarigli indicated that the draft JSNA was being finalised with a Steering Group. Six different groups had reviewed the different chapters.
- Manjeet Gill, Interim Chief Executive commented that it was a valuable document but that how Wokingham would help its most vulnerable residents needed to be further highlighted. More feedback was required, the data analysed and the key priorities identified.
- Clare Rebbeck indicated that a charity had undertaken research which provided information regarding deprivation in specific wards, which could be useful to the development of the final JSNA.
- Katie Summers commented that Public Health England had recently provided information to the Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West footprint which was at individual ward level and highlighted gaps in inequalities. Board members were informed that the gap between life expectancy for those with and without mental health problems was approximately 25 years in some areas.
- Councillor Haitham Taylor emphasised that the key outliers needed to be highlighted and addressed.
- Clare Rebbeck commented that food bank usage figures were a good indicator of deprivation.

RESOLVED: That the draft [JSNA] chapters be reviewed.

12. HEALTH AND WELLBEING PERFORMANCE DASHBOARD

Julie Hotchkiss, Interim Consultant in Public Health presented the Health and Wellbeing Performance Dashboard.

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

- With regards to 'Residents' Perception of Fear of Crime', Julie Hotchkiss indicated that if this was to go forward a bespoke survey of residents would need to be carried out. A decision would need to be taken with regards to whether or not to undertake this survey and if it were to go ahead, who would run and fund it.
- Graham Ebers, Director Corporate Services, commented that although Wokingham had a low crime rate, the perceived fear of crime was high.
- It was suggested that 'Gap in employment rate between those with a learning disability and the overall employment rate' and 'Gap in employment rate between those in contact with secondary mental health services and the overall employment rate' be selected as priority indicators.
- Julie Hotchkiss proposed that 'Self-reported: high anxiety score' be considered as a priority indicator.
- With regards to the 'Health-related quality of life for people with long-term conditions' it was noted that Wokingham was performing well but improvements could still be made.
- It was suggested that 'Dementia: Indirect Age-Standardised Recorded Prevalence (aged under 65years) per 10,000' not be included as a priority indicator.
- In response to a question from Councillor Haitham Taylor, Julie Hotchkiss indicated that an action plan would be developed around the agreed key priority indicators. The Board would be informed if measurable actions could not be produced. If this was the case the inclusion of the particular indicator would be relooked at.

RESOLVED: That

- 1) one or two of the new proposed indicators be substituted for the existing two in Priority 1;
- 2) a small group be convened to assess the value of and the cost-feasibility of commissioning an annual survey to assess the community's fear of crime;
- 3) support be given to the analysts working on the 5 Year Forward View to produce the synopsis statistic;
- 4) the specific changes to the indicators in Priority 2B, C and D be approved;
- 5) Priority 3 indicators be adjusted so that they measure inequality, and that the recommendations with regards to these indicators be accepted.
- 6) support be given to Wokingham Integrated Service Partnership analysts to produce the synopsis statistic for Priority 4.

13. BCF KEY ACHIEVEMENTS 2017-18

The Board considered the Better Care Fund Key Achievements 2017-18.

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

- The report provided a summary of Wokingham's Better Care Fund Programme performance for 2017-18 (financial year), including progress of integration, milestones, challenges, performance metrics and finances.
- Katie Summers, Director Operations Wokingham, NHS Berkshire West CCG, informed Board Members that Wokingham had done well with regards to keeping over 75's fit and healthy in their own homes.
- Although Non Elective admissions had performed less well Board members were assured that there were no particular issues in this area.

RESOLVED: That the performance of the Better Care Fund in 2017/18 be noted.

14. HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD ANNUAL REPORT 2017-18

The Board considered the Health and Wellbeing Board Annual Report 2017-18.

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

- Martin Sloan, Assistant Director Adult Services, went through the report which covered work undertaken by the Board in the 2017-18 municipal year.
- Board members asked that greater reference be made to wellbeing aspects. Clare Rebbeck asked that in particular reference be made to the Wokingham Health and Wellbeing Board community engagement and hashtag. (#WokinghamHWBB)
- A finalised report would be presented to Council.

RESOLVED: That the Health and Wellbeing Board Annual Report 2017-18 be noted.

15. UPDATE FROM BOARD MEMBERS

The Board was updated on the work of the following Board members:

Healthwatch Wokingham Borough:

- Nicola Strudley informed the Board that the Healthwatch service contract was out for tender and the results were due shortly. The new service would begin in October.
- Healthwatch Wokingham Borough had produced its annual report which would be published shortly.
- Board members were informed of a particular case study. It was clarified that Healthwatch should in future inform Martin Sloan of concerns that they received.

Place and Community Partnership:

- Clare Rebbeck encouraged Board members to participate in the Health and Wellbeing Board social media engagement.

Voluntary Sector:

- Clare Rebbeck referred to an engagement session between the Clinical Commissioning Group and the Voluntary Sector and the need for further work.

Community Safety Partnership:

- Board members were informed that the Group were currently working to reduce anti-social behaviour and a reported increase in substance misuse in Wokingham particularly in the Woosehill area through the implementation of Operation Orca.
- Following reports of young people using bags of dog mess from bins to throw at resident's properties, a problem solving task group were looking at whether tamper proof dog fouling bins could be installed in high risk areas to stop access to the contents of the bins.
- In response to a Member question, Graham Ebers explained what was meant by 'County Lines Dealing.'
- Katie Summers referred to the fear of crime and the recent incident of a bomb scare at The Oracle in Reading. Board members were assured that lessons would be learnt and shared across Thames Valley.

RESOLVED: That the update from Board members be noted.

16. FORWARD PROGRAMME

The Board discussed the forward programme.

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

- The Chairman would write to Rosie Rowe on behalf of the Health and Wellbeing Board, thanking her for her presentation regarding the Bicester Healthy New Town Programme.
- It was noted that it was Darrell Gale's last Health and Wellbeing Board meeting. The Board thanked him for his hard work and wished him well for the future.

RESOLVED: That the forward programme be noted.

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
COMMUNITY AND CORPORATE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
HELD ON 18 JUNE 2018 FROM 7.00 PM TO 8.30 PM**

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Guy Grandison (Chairman), Mike Haines (Vice-Chairman), Rachel Burgess, Clive Jones, Dianne King, David Sleight, Bill Soane and Shahid Younis

Other Councillors Present

Councillors: Malcolm Richards

Officers Present

Callum Wernham (Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist), Neil Carr (Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist), Peter Baveystock (Service Manager - Cleaner & Greener Services) and Alex Deans (Highways and Transportation Services - Reprourement Lead)

1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

RESOLVED: That Councillor Guy Grandison be elected Chairman of the Community and Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the 2018/19 municipal year.

2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

RESOLVED: That Councillor Mike Haines be appointed Vice Chairman of the Community and Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee for the 2018/19 municipal year.

3. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 12 March 2018 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

6. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no public questions.

7. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

There were no Member questions.

8. HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION CONTRACTS RENEWAL UPDATE

The Committee considered a report, set out in agenda pages 11-38, which provided an update on the progress on the process of letting major contracts relating to highways and transportation services.

The report gave details of the re-provision of the term Highways and Transportation Contracts including background, stakeholder and market engagement, scope of tendered services, partnering governance and contract form, performance management and timetable and contract award.

The report confirmed that 24 companies had registered interest in the upcoming contracts and that this showed that the Council was seen as an attractive client. The feedback received from stakeholders had favoured offering one professional services contract and one works contract. It was noted that a draft agreement had been made by the Berkshire Authorities whereby they could use Wokingham's highways management services for a charge. It was added that Wokingham's needs would always come before that of the Berkshire Authorities.

The report commented that the contracts would be for a seven year duration (from April 2019) with an option to extend the contract for a further three years. It was noted that the contracts would be financially incentivised on a curve when the contractor achieved 75% of their targets up to 100%. The new contracts would be managed using the performance framework attached to the report.

The report noted that costs of current contracts would be compared to the new tenders with the aim of delivering value for money to the Borough and its residents.

Rachel Burgess asked for clarification on the financial incentivisation of the contracts and the potential to penalise the operators in they were not hitting their targets. Alex Deans, Highways and Transportation Services – Reprocurement Lead, clarified that companies could be penalised for not performing via not receiving the financial gains which were triggered by achieving 75% and 100% of their performance targets. Alex added that this method would both penalise failing companies and encourage those who wanted to deliver the best possible service in order to maximise the financial returns.

Clive Jones queried the criteria and administrative process for filling in potholes and the resurfacing of roads. Alex Deans confirmed that the criteria and process would form a part of the new highways contracts.

Clive Jones also asked whether the Highways Team were on target to complete the contract process and whether there would be any savings when compared to the current contracts. In response, Alex Deans confirmed that Officers were still on course to meet their timetable (with regards to completing and implementing the new contracts) and in some areas there would be savings whereas in others the Council would see far better performance than was previously achieved.

RESOLVED: That:

- 1) Alex Deans be thanked for attending the meeting;
- 2) a progress report on the Highways and Transportation contracts renewal be brought to the September 2018 meeting of the Committee;
- 3) Members' of the Committee be provided with ongoing updates regarding the Highways and Transportation contracts renewal process.

9. WORK PROGRAMME 2018-19

The Committee considered a report, set out in agenda pages 39-44, which gave details of its proposed work programme for 2018/19. The Chairman asked Members' to notify him of potential additional items for inclusion in the work programme.

Members' discussed that they would like an additional meeting to be held in October 2018, in order to cover additional items in more depth. Members added that they would like to meet with the Fire Service Commander and the Police Area Commander at the October meeting.

Rachel Burgess felt that the town centre regeneration project was such a key issue that should be included on Agenda. Rachel Burgess felt that it would be too late to review the topic in November as the Market Place was scheduled to be completed by that time. Members stated that they would like regular email updates on the town centre regeneration ahead of the item due to come to the November meeting. If the updates highlighted any urgent issues, the Committee may decide to bring the item forward from November.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) the work programme for 2018/19, as amended, be noted;
- 2) Members' notify the Chairman of any further potential Scrutiny items for inclusion in the work programme;
- 3) an additional meeting of the Committee be organised for October;
- 4) the Fire Service Commander and the Police Area Commander be invited to the October 2018 meeting of the Committee;
- 5) Members receive an update briefing on Wokingham Town Centre Regeneration; to include accessibility issues;
- 6) Members notify Democratic Services of any other issues to be included in the Town Centre briefing.

10. SCRUTINY REQUEST - FINCHAMPSTEAD PARISH COUNCIL

The Committee considered a report, set out in Agenda pages 45 to 50, which provided an overview of the issues Finchampstead Parish Council was facing relating to the conditions of their footways, kerbsides and roadways.

The report gave details of some of the key areas in the Finchampstead Parish where conditions of the roadways and road furniture had been damaged or degraded over time. Other areas of concern included leaf litter and debris on kerbsides, blocked gullies which could cause flooding and damaged or dirty road signs which were not fit for purpose. Members stated that this issue was not specific to Finchampstead, and that many of their wards had similar issues.

Members discussed the process of residents reporting these issues to the Council. Peter Baveystock, Service Manager - Cleaner & Greener Services, stated that it was preferable for residents to ring up and report any issues that they had with footways, kerbsides, roadways or street furniture. He added that cases could be followed through with Finchampstead Parish Council to create an action plan which could be evaluated to see if it could be deployed Borough wide.

Guy Grandison felt that this issue tied in to the roadside contract and suggested bringing this matter to the upcoming Borough Parish Liaison Forum.

Peter Baveystock stated that in instances where issues had been reported but not rectified, the Locality Team, Cleaner & Greener Team and the Highways Team would look in to why it had taken so long for the issue to be resolved.

Members raised a number of queries regarding how Wokingham Borough Council (WBC) incorporated technology to help focus resources. Alex Deans, Highways and Transportation Services – Reprocurement Lead, stated that WBC were incorporating smarter technology to help with highway issues. One example of this was a new IT system which would allow residents to see where the 'gully cleaner' was and what it had cleaned.

In response to a Member query regarding preventative measures, Alex Deans stated that WBC did not currently have a preventative regime. He added that the current system required a Highways Inspector to spot an issue or for a resident to bring it to the Council's attention so it could be resolved.

There were a number of Member queries regarding costs associated with cleaning highways. Peter Baveystock stated that cleaning a section of the Reading Road had recently cost approximately £8,500. Peter added that where it was necessary to make sure that when these jobs were undertaken that they were carried out thoroughly.

Steve Bromley and Rowland Cundy, Finchampstead Parish Council, asked the Committee to consider who would be liable were an accident to happen due to a neglected road sign or roadway. They added that Finchampstead Parish Council were willing to buy in to a better system to make Wokingham's roads safer and cleaner, once an agreed standard was established.

A number of Members' expressed their thanks to Peter Baveystock and his team (the Cleaner and Greener Team) for all of their hard work over the years, citing fast response times and thorough work.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) Peter Baveystock, Steve Bromley and Rowland Cundy be thanked for attending the meeting;
- 2) the matter of highways, roadways and kerbsides conditions be referred to the upcoming Borough Parish Liaison Forum;
- 3) other Town and Parish Councils be invited to supply examples of footways, kerbsides and road signs requiring repair and maintenance;
- 4) a progress report be brought back to the September meeting of the Committee with an invitation extended to Peter Baveystock to present the report.

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE HELD ON 20 JUNE 2018 FROM 7.00 PM TO 8.50 PM

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Parry Batth (Chairman), Philip Houldsworth (Vice-Chairman), Andy Croy, Guy Grandison, Kate Haines, Mike Haines, Ken Miall, Malcolm Richards, Bill Soane and Shahid Younis

Officers Present

Neil Carr, Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist and Scrutiny Officer

1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

The Committee elected a Chairman for the 2018/19 Municipal Year.

RESOLVED: That Parry Batth be elected as Chairman of the Committee for the 2018/19 Municipal Year.

2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

The Committee appointed a Vice-Chairman for the 2018/19 Municipal Year.

RESOLVED: That Philip Houldsworth be appointed as Vice-Chairman of the Committee for the 2018/19 Municipal Year.

3. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted by Lindsay Ferris and Ian Pittock.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 23 May 2018 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

6. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no public questions.

7. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

There were no Member questions.

8. SELECT COMMITTEE REPORT ON OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY

The Committee considered a report, set out at Agenda pages 11 to 22, which gave details of the Government's response to the House of Commons Select Committee report on Overview and Scrutiny in local government.

The report stated that the House of Commons Select Committee for Communities and Local Government had published its report on Overview and Scrutiny in local government in December 2017. A number of the Select Committee's recommendations called for Government action. The Government subsequently published its response to the Select Committee report in March 2018.

The key elements of the Government's response were summarised as:

- the Government planned to issue new Statutory Guidance to local authorities at the end of 2018;
- the Government agreed that Overview and Scrutiny Committees should report to the full Council meeting rather than the Executive, mirroring the relationship between Select Committees and Parliament;
- the Government accepted the need to limit the Executive's involvement in Overview and Scrutiny meetings and would make it clear that Executive Members should not participate in Scrutiny other than as witnesses;
- Government guidance would make it clear that Scrutiny support officers should be able to operate independently and provide impartial advice to Members;
- the Government aimed to continue discussions about the election rather than appointment of Overview and Scrutiny Chairmen, but it did not support a pilot scheme. The Government noted that Councils already had the power to elect Chairmen;
- the Government did not accept the recommendations relating to additional resources for the Overview and Scrutiny function, believing that these matters were best left to local discretion;
- the Government agreed that there should be clear and transparent oversight of Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs).

The Scrutiny Officer gave details of recent developments relating to the publication of statutory guidance by Government later in 2018. In discussions with the Centre for Public Scrutiny the Government had indicated that it would be arranging engagement sessions and workshops with Scrutiny practitioners (including Members) in order to understand a range of views on potential improvements.

In the ensuing discussion Members raised the following points:

- Members welcomed the Government's proposed new Statutory Guidelines which would help to strengthen the operation of Overview and Scrutiny;
- Members welcomed the proposed Government stakeholder events aimed at seeking the views of Scrutiny practitioners and agreed that the Council should be represented;
- Members felt that the Council's Constitution Review Working Group should be notified that new guidelines would be circulated at the end of the year which would have implications relating to Overview and Scrutiny reporting arrangements and the involvement of Executive Members in the Scrutiny process;
- It was suggested that the Committee develop a set of performance indicators, based on best practice, which would allow Members to monitor the effectiveness of Overview and Scrutiny at the Council.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) the Government's response to the House of Commons Select Committee report be noted;
- 2) the Committee's comments on the proposals in the report be submitted to the Government, the Centre for Public Scrutiny and the Local Government Association;
- 3) Members wish to take part in the stakeholder engagement sessions relating to the emerging statutory guidance on Overview and Scrutiny, due to be held in the autumn of 2018;
- 4) the Constitution Review Working Group be notified about the Government's response to the Select Committee recommendations and the proposed publication of Statutory Guidance on Overview and Scrutiny, expected at the end of 2018;
- 5) the Committee receive a report on potential performance indicators to demonstrate the effectiveness of the Council's Overview and Scrutiny function.

9. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MEMBER TRAINING

The Committee considered a report, set out at Agenda pages 23 to 26, which gave details of the annual Scrutiny training session for Members. The training session was scheduled for 23 July 2018 (7pm). The session would provide an introduction to Overview and Scrutiny for new Members and a refresher for more experienced Members.

The Scrutiny Officer updated Members on the format of the training session and confirmed that it would include a presentation, small group discussions and practical exercises. The session would seek to emphasise the principles of effective Scrutiny:

- Providing critical friend challenge to the Executive and partner organisations;
- Reflecting and enabling the voice and concerns of residents and community groups;
- Members acting in the role of "independently minded governors" who lead and own the Scrutiny process;
- Driving improvement in public services and helping to find efficiencies and new ways of delivering services.

The Scrutiny Officer confirmed that the most suitable date for the training session was Monday 23 July 2018. He also reported that the Committee had received a Scrutiny request from Members relating to the operation of the Council's grass cutting service. It was suggested that the training session on 23 July could use the grass cutting issue as a basis for discussing the format and delivery of an effective Scrutiny review. This would allow Members to discuss the steps in undertaking a Scrutiny review such as developing the terms of reference, engagement with residents and other stakeholders, identifying key witnesses and drafting the final report.

During the ensuing discussion, Members raised the following points:

- It was felt that the training session should include a discussion on the interpretation of data and the process for setting performance indicators;

- It was noted that earlier updates on the 21st Century Council programme had indicated that the investment in improved IT would deliver more timely and accurate performance data for consideration by the Overview and Scrutiny Committees.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) the Member training session on Overview and Scrutiny be confirmed for 7pm on 23 July 2018;
- 2) the format of the session include small group discussions and exercises;
- 3) the training session use the Council's grass cutting service as an example of a Scrutiny review;
- 4) the training session include a section on the interpretation of performance data by Overview and Scrutiny Members and the process for developing "stretching" targets.

10. CONSIDERATION OF THE CURRENT EXECUTIVE AND INDIVIDUAL EXECUTIVE MEMBER DECISION FORWARD PROGRAMMES

The Committee considered a copy of the Executive Forward Programme and Individual Executive Member Decision Forward Programme, as set out on Agenda pages 27 to 36.

In the ensuing discussion Members confirmed that the following items be added to the Overview and Scrutiny work programme for 2018/19:

- Financial position of the WBC owned companies;
- Duty to Co-operate: SHMA Methodology (Strategic Housing Market Assessment).

Members noted that the item "Sites to be Declared Surplus for Disposal" had already been included in the Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) The Executive and Individual Executive Member Decision Forward Programmes be noted;
- 2) The Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee Work Programme be amended to include the items highlighted by the Committee.

11. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2018/19

The Committee considered a report, set out at Agenda pages 37 to 40, which gave details of its work programme for 2018/19.

The report reminded Members of the importance of effective work programming in prioritising issues of community concern, highlighting Scrutiny topics of most value and involving residents and community groups in the process.

The report also referred to a request for a Scrutiny review of the Council's grass cutting service. The new service had started in April 2016 following a joint procurement exercise

with the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead. The successful contractor was ISS Facility Services with the contract due to run to September 2026.

The Committee reviewed its work programme and highlighted the following issues:

- Members agreed that key lines of enquiry be developed in relation to the discussion at the next meeting with the Leader of the Council and the Chief Executive;
- Following a request from Members, the Chairman agreed that an extraordinary meeting of the Committee be held on 1 August 2018 to consider the Council's response to its duties under the Equality Act 2010 and the proposed Scrutiny review of grass cutting.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) the Committee's 2018/19 work programme, as amended, be confirmed;
- 2) key lines of enquiry be developed in advance of the next meeting in order to structure the discussions with the Leader of the Council and the Chief Executive;
- 3) that Members suggest relevant questions to be included in the key lines of enquiry, including, for example: 21st Century Council and town centre regeneration;
- 4) an extraordinary meeting of the Committee be held on 1 August 2018 to consider a report on the Equality Act 2010 and the proposed Scrutiny review of the Council's grass cutting service;
- 5) the relevant Executive Members and Directors be invited to attend the extraordinary meeting on 1 August 2018.

12. COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMMES

The Committee considered work programmes of the other Overview and Scrutiny Committees, as set out on Agenda pages 41 to 50.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) the Overview and Scrutiny Work Programmes for 2018/19, as amended, be noted;
- 2) that Overview and Scrutiny Committee Agenda aim to include a maximum of two or three substantive items in order to enable detailed Scrutiny to take place.

13. UPDATE REPORTS FROM CHAIRMEN OR NOMINATED MEMBER OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEES

The relevant Chairmen provided updates on recent issues considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committees and future Agenda items.

RESOLVED: That the update reports be noted.

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD ON 25 JUNE 2018 FROM 7.00 PM TO 9.40 PM**

Committee Members Present

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

Councillors Present and Speaking

Councillors: Andy Croy and Shahid Younis

Officers Present

Chris Easton, Service Manager, Highways Development
Mary Severin, Borough Solicitor
Justin Turvey, Operational Development Management Lead Officer (Interim)
Callum Wernham, Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist

Case Officers Present

Daniel Ray
Alex Thwaites
Graham Vaughan

11. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence.

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. It also contains details of properties to be visited prior to the next Planning Meeting. A copy is attached.

12. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Councillor Smith declared a personal interest in item 16 on the grounds that he had listed the application. He stated that he had an open mind and would not come to a decision until he had heard representations from Officers and Speakers.

13. APPLICATIONS TO BE DEFERRED AND WITHDRAWN ITEMS

No applications were recommended for deferral, or withdrawn.

14. APPLICATION NO 172048- LAND BETWEEN THAMES VALLEY BUSINESS PARK AND NAPIER ROAD (BULMERSHE AND WHITEGATES)

Proposal: Full application for proposed construction of a segregated fasttrack public transport, pedestrian and cycle bridge and viaduct, comprising concrete bridge structure with a river span of 59.5m and a land span of 316m, supported by concrete columns, steel beams and reinforced soil embankment, together with new footpath links and existing footpath alterations, replacement supermarket car parking provision, junction improvements and landscaping.

Applicant: Reading Borough Council Highways and Transport Department.

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 5 to 82.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- an update to the report regarding tree removal from other land users;
- clarification of alternative schemes, cables, accommodation bridge, marshland and journey time savings;
- an additional 16 objections.

Bill Luck, Earley Town Council, spoke in objection to the application. Bill stated that the design of the bridge was 'unsightly', and that it had not adhered to the required 'good design' as stated in the NPPF paragraph 17. He added that the proposed development would result in a loss to wildlife and that it would fail to protect the local biodiversity. Bill stated that flooding compensation would be provided but it would be located in woodland. Bill added that the viaduct would not be screened and at its closest point to the river it would only be 5 metres away from the bank. Bill stated that the proposed development would not retain the existing features and felt that it contravened paragraph 9 of the NPPF which stated that development should seek a positive improvement in the quality of the natural environment. Bill was of the opinion that there was no policy justification for the proposed development and asked that the Committee refuse the application on the grounds of severe impact on the setting, damage to the nearby grade II listed bridge and the flood risk that the development would propose.

Tamzin Morphy, Resident, spoke in objection to the application. She felt that the proposed development would ruin the visual amenity and green space provisions and would contravene local and national planning policy. Tamzin felt that the proposed development would negatively affect the most densely populated area of Reading and that less intrusive methods (of reducing traffic congestion and improving public transport services) had not been trialled. Tamzin stated that the development would cost £24 million and felt that it would devastate the local wildlife population and result in at least 766 trees being felled as a result of the development (with only 77 trees to be planted as replacements). Tamzin was of the opinion that the local grass snake and slow worm populations at the proposed development site had not been accounted for and that there would be a net loss in biodiversity as a result of the proposed development. Tamzin added that traffic levels had been falling on the London Road in recent years and felt that this application (if approved) would increase the overall traffic on the London Road as a result of more people using the MRT.

Scott Witchalls, Agent, spoke in favour of the application. He stated that the proposed development was in line with the Borough's long standing commitment to improving transport facilities, by reducing existing problems and encouraging more people to use public transport services. He stated that the land had been safeguarded for the purpose of developing an MRT scheme and that overhead power lines would be removed at the development site. Scott noted that this was a revised scheme which had taken on board comments from a range of sources. He added that the revised scheme would include a new marginal shelf (as requested by the Environment Agency), low level lighting at the road level and a managed wetland structure. Scott stated that there would be 3.5 hectares of scrubland replaced and that no grade A trees would be felled as a result of the proposed development. He added that there would be no loss in flood storage and that there would be an increase in biodiversity.

Shahid Younis, Ward Member, spoke in objection to the application. He stated that as a resident and local Councillor of the area he was concerned with the environmental impact

that the proposed development would cause. He added that the area of land proposed for development was a beautiful part of the borough which was used and enjoyed by many local residents. Shahid stated this if the Committee were minded to approve the application that they seek to mitigate any environmental damage that would be caused by the development.

Andy Croy, Ward Member, spoke in objection to the application. He felt that the 2010 Wokingham Borough Council's (WBC's) Core Strategy had no provision for a major road to be built in the area of the proposed development. He was of the opinion that the proposed development was not a MRT service and was simply another major road. He added that an MRT service was typically a light railway service and felt that the term MRT had been appropriated to fit the proposed development in to the WBC's core strategy.

Graham Vaughan, Case Officer, answered a number of Member queries. He stated that fragmentation of the habitat would occur should the proposed development go ahead, but added that a Council ecologist had assessed the site and had not objected on these grounds.

Graham stated that the site had been reserved for this use (an MRT) and it had therefore been deemed an accepted loss. He added that the development would result in 14 trees being felled in the Wokingham Borough with 37 trees being planted as replacements. Graham continued by stating that bat boxes would be installed at the site and there would be a landscape ecological mitigation plan in place. He added that the slowworms at the site would be translocated.

Graham stated that an independent design panel had assessed the plans and provided comments to aid the design of the scheme in reducing its impact on the area. He added that the Planning Officers had to weigh up the planning balance by weighing the harm that the proposed development would cause compared to the benefits that the proposed development would bring, which in this case the Officers had deemed the benefits to outweigh the harm.

In response to a Member query regarding suitable alternatives to the proposed scheme, Graham Vaughan stated that other alternatives were not sustainable. Regarding flooding, Graham confirmed that the Environment Agency no longer objected on the grounds of flooding risk.

Chris Easton, Highways and Development Manager, responded to a number of Member queries. He stated that WBC's core strategy secured provision for the proposed infrastructure in this area which would carry passengers. He clarified that the proposed scheme would fulfil that criteria and would assist in increasing the usage of public transport and reducing journey times of the buses that would use the route. Chris stated that the proposed scheme would assist with the Borough wide commitment to journey sustainability and sustainable travel.

Carl Doran queried the usage of the term MRT to describe the proposed scheme, stating that there were no proposals for light rail provisions. Chris Easton stated that the proposed scheme would deliver the feature of decreased journey time and a high quality express bus service, which was set out in WBC's core strategy and clarified that the term MRT did not solely include light rail provisions. He added that the buses would be of sustainable quality and would be fitted with modern appliances and conveniences including Wi-Fi and air conditioning, many of which would also run on alternative fuels.

Graham Vaughan responded to a query from Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey regarding the proposed marshland at the site. Graham clarified that the exact details of the marshland would be agreed upon in time but the provision of a marshland would be reserved by a condition.

Chris Easton responded to a query from John Jarvis regarding traffic relief on the A4. Chris clarified that the proposed scheme would provide general traffic relief on the surrounding roads and as a result this would aid reducing traffic congestion on the A4 corridor.

Wayne Smith commented on the proposed scheme. He felt that the proposed scheme would be unsightly and that it would come at a great financial cost to WBC and its residents. He added that at its peak height (whilst a bus was using the MRT) it would be 8 metres high from the river bank below. Justin Turvey, Operational Development Management Lead Officer (Interim), stated that the proposed development had been independently assessed and reviewed and had been found to be acceptable in terms of design and appearance.

Members raised concerns over the environmental impact that the proposed development would have on the area. Chris Bowring felt that the Committee had to carefully weigh up the harm caused (to the surrounding environment) by the proposed development against the positive benefits that it would create.

In response to Member queries regarding falling vehicle numbers on the roads, Chris Easton confirmed that although the number of vehicles on the road in question had slightly reduced between 2007 and 2010, the level had remained flat between 2010 and the current day. The identified delays at junctions within the vicinity indicated that the road was working at capacity which would cause redistribution of traffic and change in flows. The proposed scheme would provide the infrastructure for future growth and would allow for a sustainable transport improvement that would assist in encouraging further increased use of public transport.

The Committee voted on the recommendation of conditional approval subject to legal agreement and upon being put to the vote the motion to approve the application failed.

The Committee went on to discuss and review the possible reasons for refusal of the application, and upon being put to the vote it was:

RESOLVED: That application 172048 be refused due to concern over harm to the character and appearance of the area and that the application would be contrary to CP1, CP3 and CP11 of the Local Plan.

15. APPLICATION NO 180846 - ARBORFIELD GARRISON AND ADJOINING LAND (BARKHAM; FINCHAMPSTEAD SOUTH; SWALLOWFIELD; ARBORFIELD)

Proposal: Application for the approval of Reserved Matters, including layout, scale, appearance and landscaping in relation to the erection of a new primary school including nursery to be undertaken on a phased basis – Phase 1 (2FE Primary School) and Phase 2 (3FE Primary School), including the provision of hard court play area, all-weather pitch, ancillary club house block and associated access, parking and landscaping.

Applicant: Wokingham Borough Council.

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 83 to 116.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included three additional conditions.

Piers Brunning, on behalf of the Applicant, spoke in favour of the application. He stated that the scheme would deliver key components of the Arborfield SDL and would be the first of two new primary schools to be built as part of the scheme. He added that the school would be developed in two phases, with the first phase offering 420 places for pupils. Piers continued by stating that phase two would be initiated if the demand increased, with this phase offering up to 630 places for pupils. Piers stated that the school would provide a good teaching environment with a good range of teaching spaces and age appropriate areas. He stated that an all-weather sports pitch would be built on the site which would be worth double the area of a grass pitch as it could be used far in excess of a grass pitch. Piers added that the all-weather sports pitch would be available for community use when appropriate at the weekends. It was noted that there would be a dedicated community and school drop off point to supplement the staff car park.

Members commented positively on the provision of a sprinkler system at the school. Alex Thwaites, Case Officer, stated that although sprinkler provision was not a planning consideration the planning department had worked closely with the developer to ensure that the school would be sprinkler protected.

Members queried the allocation of 11 parking spaces (excluding the 37 staff spaces provided) for Phase 1 and asked whether there was any scope to increase this number. Chris Easton, Highways Development Manager, stated that the proposed parking had provisions for more than one space per staff member and therefore exceeded the Council's policy in respect of parking. He added that a parking management strategy had been secured and would be enforced should the need arise.

RESOLVED: That application 180846 be approved subject to the conditions set out in agenda pages 84 to 89 and the additional 3 conditions as set out in the Members' Update.

16. APPLICATION NO 180072 - LAND ADJACENT TO CARTEF FARM, ISLANDSTONE LANE (HURST)

Proposal: Application to vary conditions 4 (approved plans) and 5 (number of caravans on site) of planning consent 153360 to increase the number of caravans on site from 2 caravans to 4 (no more than 2 being static caravans), thereby increasing the number of gypsy pitches from 1 to 2.

Applicant: Mr and Mrs Henry and Samantha Giles.

The Committee received and reviewed a report, set out on agenda pages 117-134.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- an update to the name of the applicant;
- a correction to paragraph 24;
- a representation from Hurst Parish Council.

Howard Larkin, Hurst Parish Council, spoke in objection to the application. He felt that the application would result in major intensification of the site and failed to address CP11. He added that the site was an unsustainable location, with the nearest shop and school being too far away for pedestrian access. He stated that the roads leading to the site were single track and that the area had experienced six instances of flooding since 1947. Howard stated the Wokingham Borough Council (WBC) had an 11.54 year traveller land supply. He asked that the Committee refuse the application for the reasons stated.

Lou Robinson, Spokesperson on behalf of the Hurst Village Society, spoke in objection to the application. She stated that WBC had an 11.54 year traveller pitch land supply and it was therefore not appropriate to intensify the existing site. She added that the existing dwelling on the site was very large and the Council should limit traveller sites being excessively far away from existing developments. Lou felt that the Council needed to do more to check that occupants of GRT sites indeed met the definition of a traveller and asked that the Committee refuse the application for the reasons stated.

Matthew Green, Agent, spoke in favour of the application. He stated that this application would not be for a new development and that the use of the land had already been permitted. He added that there would be intensification on the site but this would not constitute a material change of use. Matthew stated that Officers had agreed that the site was sustainable and that Landscape Officers had agreed that this application to vary conditions would result in the betterment of the local scene.

Daniel Ray, Case Officer, responded to a number of Member queries regarding intensification, land supply, flooding and change in character of the area. He stated that the site had no named consent and that the occupants would have to meet the criteria of the conditions. Regarding land supply, Daniel stated that the site was acceptable in all other matters. Daniel stated that at appeal (for the original planning application) the site was deemed an accessible location, which was a strong material consideration. Daniel stated that the inspector had deemed that there were other options available should the road become inaccessible due to flooding and had found the site acceptable on these grounds. Daniel stated that there would be betterment of the site compared to the current dwelling and this would help to negate the change in character of the area.

Members had concerns over the proposal of a new stable (in a different position on the site) which would be approximately twice the size of the existing stable. Daniel Ray stated that the new stable would be part of the variation of conditions and was not materially different in principal. He added that the previous planning permission allowed for the provision of a stable.

Wayne Smith proposed that the application be refused as it would result in intensification of the site through increased number of pitches and increased size of barn which would result in harm to the character and appearance of countryside and area. This was seconded by John Jarvis.

Upon being put to the vote it was:

RESOLVED: That application 180072 be refused as it would result in intensification of the site through increased number of pitches and increased size of barn which would result in harm to the character and appearance of countryside and area.

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
LICENSING AND APPEALS COMMITTEE
HELD ON 27 JUNE 2018 FROM 7.00 PM TO 9.35 PM**

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Rachel Burgess, Lindsay Ferris, John Halsall, John Jarvis, Abdul Loyes, Barrie Patman, Malcolm Richards, Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey, Chris Smith, Bill Soane and Oliver Whittle

Officers Present

Luciane Bowker, Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist
Laura Driscoll, Principal Officer, Public Protection Partnership
Julia O'Brien, Licensing Team Manager
Neil Allen, Legal Advisor to the Committee

1. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

Councillor Barrie Patman was elected Chairman of the Licensing and Appeals Committee for the 2018/19 municipal year.

2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

Councillor Bill Soane was appointed Vice-Chairman of the Licensing and Appeals Committee for the 2018/19 municipal year.

3. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted from Councillors Chris Bowring, Mike Haines and Emma Hobbs.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 21 March 2018 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

5. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Councillor John Halsall stated that he had no pecuniary interest in any event or license, except indirectly through one of the clubs for which he was a member or for one of the landowners who let their land.

He declared a personal interest in relation to the Cumulative Impact Assessment and stated that he had been a resident in Remenham for almost forty years and previously Henley. He had been a Henley Royal Regatta competitor. He was a member of Henley Royal Regatta, Henley Rowing Club, Leander and Upper Thames Rowing Club, for whom he had been the licensee, the event's organiser and one of the founder members. He rowed practically every day from Upper Thames. He had coached for Leander and Upper Thames. He had umpired for most events on the reach. He was the Chairman of Remenham Parish Council, a member of the Remenham Farm Residents Association and the neighbour of Remenham Farm. He was or had been friends with all the landowners and many of the licensees.

Councillor Halsall left the room during the discussion of item 9.

6. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no public questions.

7. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

There were no Member questions.

8. CRITERIA POLICY FOR LICENSED VEHICLES

The Committee considered the Criteria Policy for Licensed Vehicles report which was set out in agenda pages 13-52.

Laura Driscoll, Principal Officer, Public Protection Partnership introduced the report and stated that the report contained the criteria proposal and the results of the consultation.

Laura Driscoll stated that the proposal included dimensions for wheelchair accessibility, as per the Committee's request. The dimensions were based on guidelines issued in the Republic of Ireland.

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

- In response to a question Julia O'Brien, Licensing Team Leader stated that West Berkshire did have a wheelchair accessibility policy. All vehicles in their fleet were wheelchair compliant, apart from 4 vehicles which had a swivel seat and had a protected plate;
- Councillor Ferris asked if there was a list of models that the drivers could use as a guide to buy their vehicles. He was also interested to know if the assessments that had been carried out had been undertaken under this guidelines which had not yet been approved;
- Laura Driscoll stated that the issue was that models varied depending on which year they were produced and the commercial model. She stated that measurements were a more reliable method and she expected that anyone looking to purchase a vehicle would be able to use it;
- Julia O'Brien confirmed that the assessments had been carried out against the current policy;
- Julia O'Brien informed that most of the fleet had now been checked by the RAC (on behalf of the Licensing Authority), 75 vehicles had been checked with 5 still outstanding. The result was that 45% of the cars that were checked were compliant;
- Councillor Soane asked what would happen if a driver purchased a vehicle in accordance to this guidelines and then subsequently the government issued a different policy;
- Councillor Richards pointed out that the government usually allowed for a period of around two years so that people could adjust to the new policy;
- Councillor Shepherd-DuBey suggested that training should be given to drivers in relation to Special Educational Needs (SEN) students, especially those involved in school transport. Julia O'Brien stated that such training was already in place and that all drivers undertook disability awareness training;
- Councillor Richards stated that it was necessary to include within the guidelines the recommended ramp gradient;
- Councillor Burgess asked if consideration in relation to the financial impact on current drivers had been taken into account;
- Laura Driscoll stated that it was for the Committee to decide how this new policy would apply to current vehicles. She recommended that a significant amount of time be allowed for drivers to comply so that drivers did not incur in an immediate financial burden;

- Councillor Halsall felt uneasy expressing an opinion in this matter which involved an environmental impact and the livelihood of drivers. He proposed that a working group be set up to look at this issue in more detail;
- Councillor Ferris stated that he was not sure the figures were correct or not, but it was a starting point. He believed that it was a good idea to set up a working group and that a representative from the trade should be invited to take part;
- In response to a question Julia O'Brien stated that the main issue with deferring a decision was that drivers would still not be certain which vehicles they should buy;
- Laura Driscoll stated that one option was to ask that all vehicles be purposefully built, however this option would be unpopular because such cars were more expensive;
- Councillor Richards suggested adding the measurements as an appendix to the policy in order to facilitate changes as and when necessary;
- Members stated that in drawing up the policy, consideration in relation to the environment should be given;
- Councillor Halsall stated that in his personal experience the sizes and technology of wheelchairs had changed considerably in recent years; therefore he was concerned with adding measurements to the policy.

Members were in favour of deferring the decision and to create a working group to look at the proposed policy in more details. It was agreed that existing licences would be extended until a new policy was adopted.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) A working group will be formed to discuss the proposed Criteria Policy for Licensed Vehicles;
- 2) The working group will include elected Members, Licensing Officers, Environment Officers and a representative from the trade;
- 3) The working group's recommendations will be brought back for the Committee's consideration at its September meeting.

9. REVIEW OF STATEMENT OF LICENSING POLICY

The Committee considered the Review of Statement of Licensing Policy report which was set out in agenda pages 53-100.

Julia O'Brien, Licensing Team Manager stated that the Council was required to review its Statement of Licensing Policy (SLP) every five years. The SLP outlined the general approach of the licensing authority when making decisions under the Licensing Act 2003, the policy could be reviewed and revised by the authority at any time. The current Wokingham SLP must undergo a review and be re-published by the end of September 2018.

Julia O'Brien stated that a consultation had taken place and the comments received were attached to the report, as well as the Officer's analysis of the comments.

Some of the consultees had asked the Chairman for permission to speak at the meeting, in view of the high level of interest the Chairman agreed to allow them to make a statement to the Committee.

The speakers were called in the order in which the requests were received.

Sue Dowling addressed the Committee and these were some of the main points put forward by her:

- The suggestion of the CIP was not clear during the consultation process;
- There was not a high concentration of licences in the Remenham area, with only six licensed premises which authorised daily licensable activities;
- There needed to be evidence to support consultation as stated in the House of Commons briefing paper which was circulated to the Committee;
- The evidence should be strong enough to stand up to scrutiny; it should include statistics on anti-social behaviour for example;
- It had not been possible to draft a response as there had not been any evidence put forward;
- The Henley Regatta had a good track record;
- Due to the lack of evidence it was inappropriate to introduce a CIP;
- None of the responsible authorities were in favour of the introduction of a CIP;
- The statistics provided by Thames Valley Police showed that crime and disorder in the area were decreasing and not increasing;
- The limited licences amounted to approximately 20 days a year.

Councillor Whittle asked Sue Dowling what impact the CIP would have on the Henley Regatta. Sue Dowling stated that she was not in a position to respond, however there could be a financial implication and a detrimental effect to Henley. She stated that the licences brought life to the town, attracting visitors, investment and infrastructure.

In response to a question the Chairman confirmed that there would be further opportunity to discuss the other elements of the SLP, this meeting was considering the CIP element of it only.

James Rankin addressed the Committee and these were some of the main points put forward by him:

- He was concerned that Councillor Halsall had taken part in discussions in relation to CIP at previous meetings as he clearly had a connection with Remenham. He was seeking to ascertain that Councillor Halsall would not take part in the discussion of the item as this may raise the perception of bias;
- Evidence should have been provided before the consultation took place; it was not good enough to just decide that it may be a good idea to introduce a CIP and go out to consultation;
- The legislation introducing Cumulative Impact Assessments (CIA) was introduced in April 2018 and set out very strict criteria to justify CIAs;
- The proper procedures had not been followed with respect to the consultation;
- The email which was sent out on 9 May 2018 setting out the consultation contained insufficient or no information; it also incorrectly referred to CIP rather than CIA;
- CIA had replaced CIP and there was a significant difference which was not just the name, but it represented important reforms of the way in which cumulative impact measures may be adopted by licensing authorities;
- There had been fatal failures in the process which undermined the process;
- The consultation period was not long enough and the relevant people such as local residents, licence holders and businesses had not been consulted;

- The consultation needed to include a map clearly indicating the area, it was not sufficient to just say Remenham;
- The consultation should have included information in relation to which types of licensable activities were being questioned;
- There were weak grounds for CIP in Remenham, this was something that happened in larger cities;
- Thames Valley Police had made no response to the consultation;
- The issue of overcrowding which had been raised three years ago had now been resolved;
- Issues with current licences could be challenged through hearings and cumulative impact could be taken into account.

In response to a question James Rankin stated that he represented The Copas Partnership who had been operating events in Henley for approximately 40 years.

Michael Dudley addressed the Committee and these were some of the main points put forward by him:

- 18 months ago he stood in a Sub-Committee hearing in relation to Henley Swim and was told that cumulative impact could not be taken into account because Wokingham did not have a CIP. This advice was given by the Legal advisor to the Panel;
- He was seeking reassurance that in future hearings the cumulative impact would be taken into account;
- He stated that he did not have a problem with the current licences, but he was looking into the future and potential new licences;
- The adoption of a CIP would not affect the current licences, it would not be retrospective;
- Although there were only 20 days of events, there was the setting up and taking down days which should also be considered;
- The Henley Regatta attracted approximately 100.000 people and the Rewind Festival around 40.000 people and most people travelled by car creating public nuisance and safety concerns;
- This level of activity was a public nuisance;
- The main access to the area was through Remenham Lane or Remenham Church Lane, which were totally unsuited to such volumes of traffic;
- There were no trains or buses and there was a major problem with traffic;
- He believed that traffic was a licensing issue, if licences were not issued there would not be a problem with traffic;
- He pointed out that the high volume of traffic created a health and safety concern, with emergency vehicles not being able to attend promptly to emergencies.

In response to a comment the Chairman explained that cumulative impact polices were designed to deal areas in which events happened concurrently.

Anthony West addressed the Committee and these were some of the main points put forward by him:

- He concurred with all the points raised by Michael Dudley;
- He emphasized that although there were only 20 days of events, this did not account for the setting up and taking down time. The Henley Regatta for example, started

setting in April and only finished in August, therefore amounting to a cumulative impact effect;

- The residents of the parish of Remenham had been suffering public nuisance for a number of years;
- He believed the CIP should be adopted to consider future applications.

Councillor Halsall explained that he had not previously declared an interest because the Committee had not previously been required to make a decision in relation to the adoption of a CIP.

Councillor Halsall circulated a paper containing his statement which he then read out to the Committee, and these were some of the main points put forward by him:

- The allegation that the process was not followed correctly could be disputed;
- The legislation permitted the adoption of a CIP in rural areas and the responses that indicated the contrary were incorrect;
- All licensing determinations should be considered on case-by-case basis. They should take into account any representations or objections that have been received from responsible authorities or other persons, and representations made by the applicant or premises user as the case may be;
- The authority's decision should be evidence-based, justified as being appropriate for the promotion of the licensing objectives and proportionate to what it is intended to achieve;
- The purpose of incorporating Cumulative Impact Assessments (CIA) (as they are now called) in the Act itself is purely to improve transparency and to ensure that the policy is based on evidence. The Act simply sets out a statutory process by which a CIA should be introduced, but it does not raise the bar as to when it would be appropriate to do so. Nor does the new legislation say anything about when or where it might be appropriate to introduce a CIA;
- This Committee has significant evidence upon which to base the introduction of a CIA in Remenham;
- It is up to the Committee to consider the whole of the evidence before reaching a decision;
- There is no law or policy that dictates that CIAs cannot be introduced in rural areas, nor that they can only relate to premises with permanent licences;
- In deciding whether to consult upon and then ultimately publish a CIA, the licensing authority has to look at the area that it has in mind and decide whether it is appropriate to limit the number or types of new licences that it might grant in that area in the future. As part of the cumulative impact it would consider any evidence that is part of that impact, including any relevant existing licences that are contributing to the impact;
- The introduction of a CIA is intended to bring balance between the introduction of new businesses and the interest of existing residents;
- The CIA would redress the balance from permissively allowing every new licence that came along to be granted, adding to the cumulative impact to a situation where every new applicant would have to demonstrate that they would not add to the saturated situation that currently exists;
- It is true that cumulative impact can always be raised as an issue in any application, even in the absence of a policy such as a CIA. But the difference with the introduction of a policy is that the burden of proof switches to the applicant to show that they will not add to cumulative impact, rather than, as currently being upon residents to prove that the new application will add to cumulative impact;

- The representations indicate that the “current system is working”. It might be said to be working for new applicants, but it most certainly is not working for the residents and constituents of Remenham;
- The cumulative impact that is suffered in Remenham as a result of the concentration of licences is overwhelming, it is an exceptional situation in a rural area.

Councillor Halsall left the room and the Committee carried out a discussion.

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

- Neil Allen, Legal advisor the Committee advised the Committee that a decision was required as to whether to carry on with an assessment on the possibility of drafting CIA or not;
- Neil Allen stated that If the Committee were to decide to carry on with the assessment, all the various points that were raised would be carefully taken into account with Legal professional advice; this would then be submitted to the Committee again at a later date;
- Councillor Shepherd-DuBey was concerned with the claim that the consultation had not been adequate. Neil Allen stated that he could not at this stage comment on it;
- Councillor Richards asked how long it would take if the process had to be re-started with another consultation. Neil Allen stated that there was no set period of time;
- Councillor Richards asked if, cumulative impact could be considered at hearings if the CIP was not adopted. Neil Allen stated that new legislation had been issued in April and any lawyer present at a hearing would be able to advise;
- In response to a question Neill Allen confirmed that a CIA would not affect existing licences but it could affect new licences;
- Councillor Ferris stated that he understood the issues raised by the Remenham residents and he believed that something needed to done to contain the problem. However, he was concerned that the consultation may not have been carried out properly and may have to be undertaken again;
- Councillor Shepherd-DuBey was interested to know if the consultation had been done under the new or old legislation. Laura Driscoll stated that she was not certain and would have to refer back to her notes. In response to a question Laura Driscoll stated that she had not consulted with Legal before setting up the consultation;
- Councillor Loyes asked if there were any time constraints in making a decision. Neil Allen stated that the SLP had to be re-published by September, however the consideration as to whether to adopt a CIP or not could be undertaken at any time.

After much debate the Chairman stated that there were three possible alternatives:

- To decide that there is not enough evidence to move forward towards drafting a CIA;
- To decide that there is enough evidence to move forward towards drafting a CIA but the process needs straightening out; or
- To decide that more evidence is needed in order to decide whether to move forward or not and defer the decision.

The Chairman urged the Committee to consider the implication of their decision. He pointed out that it was important to make sure that all processes were followed correctly and that the Legal assistance that was required would be costly. It was imperative to avoid a situation where the Council may be putting itself at risk of expensive legal challenges.

Neill Allen stated that although the SLP had to be revised every five years, it could be reviewed at any time by the Local Authority.

Councillor Whittle pointed out that the recommendation in the report was specifically in relation to CIA to Remenham. Laura Driscoll stated that there no significant proposed changes to the SLP. She stated that the CIA could be split from the SLP in a future report.

In response to a question Neil Allen stated that CIAs had to relate to a specific area.

Councillor Ferris stated that he felt that there was insufficient information available to allow for a decision to be made at this point in time.

Councillor Shepherd-DuBey urged the Licensing department to engage with the Legal department before bringing back a paper to the Committee.

Councillor Smith believed that there was enough evidence to proceed with the drafting of a CIA. However, upon being put to the vote the majority voted to defer the decision to the next meeting, with more robust information being requested.

RESOLVED That: The consideration of the drafting of a Cumulative Impact Assessment for the Remenham area be deferred to the next meeting of the Committee.

10. REVIEW OF STATEMENT OF GAMBLING PRINCIPLES

The Committee considered the Review of Statement of Gambling Principles which was set out in agenda pages 101-106

Laura Driscoll explained that there was a legal requirement to review the Local Authority Gambling Statement every three years. The present statement was published to take effect from the end of January 2016, therefore it was time to undertake a review in order to have it re-published to take effect by the end of January 2019.

Laura Driscoll stated that there were no significant changes from the previous policy. The results from the consultation were listed in the report and the comments were fair.

Laura Driscoll stated that the final version of the Statement would be brought back to the Committee in September, prior to it being referred to Council for approval in November.

In response to a question Laura Driscoll stated that there were around 10 gambling premises in the Borough.

RESOLVED That the Committee endorses the proposed amendments contained in the report.

11. SUB-COMMITTEE PROCEDURE

The Committee considered the Sub-Committee Procedure report which was set out in agenda pages 117-122.

Laura Driscoll proposed to change paragraph 1.1 of the procedure to three working days, and Members were in agreement to change it.

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

- Councillor Halsall disagreed with the proposal that the Sub-Committee be selected by Democratic Services, he believed that there should be a rotation system;
- Luciane Bowker, Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist explained the selection process was based on:
 - Members availability to attend hearings during the day
 - Avoidance of conflict of interest
 - Attendance to training
 - Cross-party representation
- Members noted that on certain occasions it was also important to consider continuity;
- Going forward, Luciane Bowker offered to send an email to all Members of the Licensing and Appeals Committee and select on a first come first serve basis (bearing in mind any conflict of interest). Members were in agreement with this.

Luciane Bowker pointed out that the proposed procedure excluded the time limitation for representations. Laura Driscoll confirmed that she had had legal advice on this issue, and she had been advised that it was better not to have a time limit. It would be at the Chairman's discretion to keep the time equally fair to both parties. Members were in favour of this.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) The Committee approves the information and Procedure document subject to the following amendments:
 - a) When a Sub-Committee meeting is required, Democratic Services will notify all Members of the Licensing and Appeals Committee via email and select the Panel on a first come first serve basis (provided that the other legal requirements are met)
 - b) Paragraph 1.1 will be amended to read: *"The applicant will normally be required to attend the meeting in person. They will be entitled to be represented by a solicitor or counsel or by any other individual provided that the name of any such person is given to Democratic Services three clear working days in advance of the hearing."*

12. LICENSING COMMITTEE FORWARD PLAN

The Committee considered the forward plan for the 2018/19 municipal year.

Laura Driscoll referred to the list of forthcoming items listed in the report. She stated that the Fees and Charges would be amalgamated between the three authorities who formed the Public Protection Partnership (PPP), this would be discussed at the September meeting.

Members asked that the Fees and Charges report include benchmarking with authorities outside of PPP.

Laura Driscoll informed that training sessions would be available at the three authorities, the dates would be confirmed shortly.

Councillor Whittle asked that Licensing Officers consulted with Wokingham Town Council and Woodley Town Council in relation to Street Trading.

Councillor Halsall asked that a list of Wokingham's licensing policies be circulated to the Committee.

In response to a question Laura Driscoll stated that she intended to produce a briefing note on Pet Shops, with an update containing the new government legislation in relation to animal licensing.

Laura Driscoll explained that in order to enable the Statement of Licensing Policy to be submitted to Council in November, it was necessary to change the date of the next meeting to a week earlier. Members agreed to change the date of the next meeting to 4 September 2018.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) The Committee noted the forward plan report;
- 2) The date of the next meeting be changed to 4 September 2018.

Decision made in the presence of:
 Tom Beck, Transport and Road Safety Contractor
 Matt Gould, Service Manager, Transport & Road Safety
 Callum Wernham, Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist

**INDIVIDUAL EXECUTIVE MEMBER
 DECISION RECORD SHEET
 IMD 2018/27**

Title of the report	Western Rail Link to Heathrow
----------------------------	--------------------------------------

DECISION MADE BY Leader of the Council - Charlotte Haitham Taylor
ACTION BY Interim Director of Environment - Josie Wragg
DECISION MADE ON 28 June 2018

Recommendation contained in the report

That the Leader of the Council:

1. notes the contents of the Western Rail Link to Heathrow consultation;
2. approves the response to consultation as detailed in this report (appendix 1).

Decision

That the Leader of the Council:

1. notes the contents of the Western Rail Link to Heathrow consultation;
2. approves the response to consultation as detailed in this report (appendix 1).

Reasons for Decision if different to recommendation

N/A

Alternative options considered and rejected at time of the decision

N/A

Summary of consultations undertaken

SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES	
Interim Director of Environment	None Received
Monitoring Officer	None Received
Leader of the Council	None Received

Reasons why the report was deemed to have contained confidential or Exempt information (if applicable)

N/A

Any Conflict of interest declared by any Executive Member who is consulted by a Member which relates to the decision

None

Any dispensation granted by the Head of Paid Service in respect of any declared conflict of interest

None

Background papers

Response to Network Rail Consultation

PUBLISHED ON: 28 June 2018

EFFECTIVE ON: 6 July 2018

CALL-IN PERIOD EXPIRES: 5 July 2018

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF
THE EXECUTIVE
HELD ON 28 JUNE 2018 FROM 7.30 PM TO 8.10 PM**

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Charlotte Haitham Taylor (Chairman), Julian McGhee-Sumner, Richard Dolinski, Stuart Munro, Pauline Helliar-Symons, Norman Jorgensen, Pauline Jorgensen, Simon Weeks and Philip Mirfin

Other Councillors Present

Anthony Pollock
Laura Blumenthal
Gary Cowan
Helen Power
Imogen Shepherd-DuBey
Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey
Shahid Younis

11. COUNCILLOR KEITH BAKER

Councillor Charlotte Haitham Taylor announced that Keith Baker had stepped down from his role as Executive Member for Highways and Transport. On behalf of the Executive Councillor Haitham Taylor expressed thanks for Councillor Baker's contribution to the work of the Council in his Executive role over the past six months.

12. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence received.

Following the resignation of Councillor Baker, Councillor Anthony Pollock attended the meeting in his role as Deputy Executive Member for Highways and Transport. In accordance with legislation Councillor Pollock was able to take part in any discussions but was not entitled to vote.

13. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Executive held on 31 May 2018 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

14. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Councillor Norman Jorgensen declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 15 Shareholders' Report by virtue of the fact that his wife was a paid Non-Executive Director of WBC Holdings Ltd. Councillor Jorgensen remained in the meeting during discussions and voted on the matter.

Councillors Pauline Jorgensen and Stuart Munro declared personal interests in Agenda Item 15 Shareholders' Report by virtue of the fact that they were paid Non-Executive Directors of WBC Holdings Ltd. Councillors Jorgensen and Munro remained in the meeting during discussions and voted on the matter.

Councillor Philip Mirfin declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 15 Shareholders' Report by virtue of the fact that he was a paid Non-Executive Director of Optalis Holdings Ltd. Councillor Mirfin remained in the meeting during discussions and voted on the matter.

Councillor Anthony Pollock declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 15 Shareholders' Report by virtue of the fact that he was a paid Non-Executive Director of Optalis Holdings Ltd. Councillor Pollock remained in the meeting during discussions but did not vote on the matter as he was in attendance in his role as a Deputy Executive Member.

15. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

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

15.1 Keith Malvern asked the Leader of the Council the following question:

Question

In the Wokingham Paper of the 31st of May the Leader of the Council is quoted as saying 'The residents sent us a clear message on May 3, we have heard that message and are listening to them. If our residents feel they are not being listened to, then we need to redouble our efforts to show that we have taken on board what they have to say.' How is that compatible with the proposals to take away the remaining school crossing patrollers despite a petition with more than 200 signatures including those from two new Councillors elected on the 3rd of May?

Answer

The petition is due to be debated at full Council in July to ensure that the issues raised in the consultation and the concerns raised by residents are listened to. Following this a report will be considered by the Executive on 26 July. I would stress that until the petition has been properly debated and the report has been to the Executive, we are still considering the matter. That is the transparent and honest way to deal with these issues and is consistent with our commitment to demonstrate to residents that we have taken on board their views when we are making decisions.

Supplementary Question

There is a published intention to construct some crossings, be they zebra crossings, pelican crossings or puffin crossings (perhaps albatross might be more appropriate). That is in the public domain. I was also led to understand that issues relating to redundancy were on the cards. Have these been put on hold and is it the intention to carry on with these crossings?

Supplementary Answer

As I said, we are taking a pause and the costs that you have in the paper front of you are not entirely accurate. The Executive report will give fuller detail and I am sure that you will come along to listen to the debate. In relation to the proposed redundancies, they are subject to consultation at the moment, which is going on longer than was originally proposed.

15.2 Tahir Maher asked the Executive Member for Environment, Leisure and Libraries the following question:

Before the recent council elections, I asked a question about an unnecessary suggestion that the much used Maiden Erlegh library may close. At this Executive, I was informed that the decision was to be held back until June (after the local elections). I ask the Executive and the Council again what is being done to ensure that the much used Maiden Erlegh library is kept open.

Answer

The response to the previous question stated that the decision to end the Council's use of the Maiden Erlegh School site library was taken by Maiden Erlegh School in February 2018 in accordance with the lease arrangements that have been in place for 34 years.

Prior to this the school requested that the Council change the opening hours of the library to be after the end of the school day. This the Council did from 2 January 2018. It was disappointing, therefore, that only a few weeks later the school terminated our lease, closing the library.

In response to your previous supplementary question, I said we intended to bring a paper to the June Executive on our library service and the impact of closing the Maiden Erlegh library. There is a paper at this evening's meeting explaining how the Council continues to meet its statutory obligations to provide a comprehensive and efficient library service for the residents of Wokingham Borough.

The assessment shows that the Council has been successful in providing an increasingly well-used library service for the people who live, work and visit the Borough. The closure of the Maiden Erlegh Library is likely to have only a small impact on residents' ability to access library services due to the close proximity of alternative libraries that are open for substantially longer hours each week.

Finally just to repeat – the decision to close the library was taken by Maiden Erlegh School not me.

Supplementary Question

There will be locations within Maiden Erlegh where the library could be relocated. The Council is spending a huge amount of money redeveloping Wokingham town centre. Surely, we could spend a few hundred thousand on a much needed library for the local community?

Supplementary Answer

Again, just to repeat, it was the school that closed the library, not us. We had no desire to close the library, so you should direct your ire to the school rather than us.

The Lower Earley library is less than a mile away and the Woodley library is about 2.5 miles away, so there are other libraries that serve the area that people can get to. When we started our assessment of the people who use this library we were concerned that there might be a number of vulnerable people who could not get to other libraries. There are 6 pensioners who use the Maiden Erlegh library and no other library. Our library staff are focussing on people like this to assess whether they can still access services.

The vast majority of people who only use the Maiden Erlegh library (there are 171 of them) are pupils of the school and their immediate families, so it is a school issue rather than a community issue. We have been doing lots over the years to increase the footfall in our libraries and have been very successful in doing that. The strategy we have for libraries is working compared to other boroughs where usage of libraries is dropping. We do everything we can to encourage people to use our libraries.

16. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

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

16.1 Gary Cowan asked the Executive Member for Business, Economic Development and Strategic Planning the following question:

Re: IMD 2018/28 Duty to Cooperate: SHMA Methodology, Executive - Individual Member Decisions - Monday, 9th July, 2018 3.00 pm

As this IMD has serious implications for Wokingham and its residents I am very surprised to see it “hidden” in an IMD.

Can you therefore give me an update on it as it is scheduled to be determined in 10 days’ time?

Answer

Legislation requires Councils to work together to ensure strategic issues, which cut across local authority boundaries, are properly addressed. I am sure that you know this from your work in this area. With regards to housing, Councils are required in government policy and guidance to identify Housing Market Areas (HMA). These are functional areas which have a relationship in terms of house prices, migration and commuting patterns.

At present this Council, and the other Berkshire local authorities, rely on the Berkshire (including South Bucks) Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) as the most up-to-date assessment of housing issues. This identifies two HMAs relevant to the Berkshire local authorities – a Western Berkshire HMA focused on Reading (which includes Wokingham Borough, West Berkshire, and Bracknell Forest in addition to Reading), and an Eastern Berkshire HMA focused on Slough (which includes RBWM and South Bucks in addition to Slough). The identified HMAs were subject to public consultation in 2015 as part of the study’s preparation.

To assist local plan processes across Berkshire, each of the Berkshire local authorities has been asked to sign a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) confirming their continued agreement with the HMA geography. The MoU is not legally binding, but provides a transparent way of recording a working agreement. It can be reviewed at any time.

The MoU does not consider housing numbers. On this we expect the government to introduce a standardised methodology for calculating housing need across England shortly. This will supersede any previous calculation.

The signing of the MoU does not have serious implications for Wokingham Borough and it is certainly not hidden. The MoU simply reflects the facts of how places in Berkshire relate to each other as recommended in a study which has been in the public domain since 2015 and was widely consulted on.

I am due to consider a report on the MoU at a public meeting on 12 July 2018. The report and details of the meeting will be available in the normal way on our website.

Supplementary Question

In relation to my point about information being hidden in IMDs. For example, the Leader of the Council signed an IMD on 4 June which was in your name. The IMD report took a line on supporting SDL building using volume builders as opposed to small and medium sized local builders. I would add that the response to Government was, generally speaking, excellent, but with regard to IMDs why was this crucial Government consultation not part of

a residents' consultation or, for that matter, brought to Council to allow Members to debate it in full and not have it buried in an IMD?

Supplementary Answer

I was aware of the particular consultation you mentioned (Revisions to the National Planning Policy Framework), read the report and talked to Officers about it. We are waiting to receive a response.

That particular IMD would have originally been signed by Councillor David Lee who was leading on that activity, but, as you are aware, he lost his seat, so the Leader signed the IMD. It was important that we got across our thoughts for the Government to consider and they are telling us that they will respond before the summer recess. It is important for us to say whether we agree or not with what they are suggesting.

Of course, Members and the public are able to attend these IMD meetings if they wish and are able to make a contribution.

16.2 Rachelle Shepherd-Dubey asked the Executive Member for Highways and Transport the following question:

There are complaints about OTT Parking enforcement (CPE) at Dinton Pastures for parents dropping off/picking up their children attending scout functions at the Dinton Activity centre. They are not being given 10 minutes to do so. Winnersh 1st Scouts are paying WBC about £6000 a year for use of the building. Why can't some leeway be given?

Answer

Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) visits generally occur twice daily at the Council Country Parks, once in the morning and once in the evening. In order to establish whether a car has been parked on site for more than the 10 minute grace period, our inspectors routinely take down the registration numbers when they arrive at the site. This appears to have given the impression to a number of parents recently that they were being targeted for parking tickets which was not the case. As far as WBC are aware no parents dropping or picking up their children from Scouts have received parking tickets where they have been parked on the site for less than 10 minutes.

Supplementary Question

The scouts are having problems in attracting adult volunteers because they have to pay for parking in addition to volunteering their time. Since this volunteering is, in effect, a free service which the Council is not paying for, can anything be done to give these volunteers free parking, for example by providing stickers for the time they are volunteering at the Scouts Centre?

Supplementary Answer

I will provide a written response to your supplementary question.

16.3 Imogen Shepherd-DuBey asked the Executive Member for Highways and Transport the following question:

We have recently had a consultation on School Crossing Patrollers, but I do not see when the results will be published? We had the same situation, last year, when we lost several School Crossing Patrollers, but I cannot see that a report was issued containing the results and the responses from the Council.

In the interests of transparency, when will these results be publicly available?

Answer

The Safe School Crossing Patrol consultation report is available on the council's website at www.wokingham.gov.uk/consultations. It is in the Finished Consultations section.

Supplementary Question

There is also a consultation on the Council Budget and we don't appear to have the results of that either?

Supplementary Answer

I cannot comment on consultations outside my remit.

Councillor Haitham Taylor stated that a written response would be provided in relation to the Budget consultation issue.

16.4 Carl Doran asked the Executive Member for Highways and Transport the following question. Due to his inability to attend the meeting a written reply was provided.

Can the Executive Member for Highways please supply a list of road traffic accidents that have occurred on the A4 London Road in Earley, over the last two years?

Answer

There have been 7 collisions during the period 1st March 2016 – 28th Feb 2018 along the London Road in Earley, from its junction with Sutton Seeds Roundabout up to Bath Road, including Shepherd Hill roundabout/gyratory.

Records indicate that these have been either rear end shunts or as a result of drivers failing to look, or give way at the roundabouts. There are no engineering solutions that could be put in place to address this driver behaviour.

16.5 Helen Power asked the Executive Member for Highways and Transport the following question:

I was contacted by a resident regarding a pointless sign recently erected on the Finchampstead Road by the Russley Green junction. I discovered that this sign, along with five others in the Borough, were requested by David Lee, when he was Executive Member for Strategic Highways. They were erected to inform motorists that new roads are being constructed and apparently this also gives a reason why motorists might feel their journey times are increasing due to the roadworks. The signs cost around £430 each, but that doesn't include the installation costs which are likely to be higher than the cost of each sign.

How is it that an Executive Member can get away with this sort of extra expense when the same money would have paid for a school crossing patroller for a year?

Answer

The signs referred to are part of a comprehensive communications plan that aims to increase the flow of information to residents about roadworks, highways improvements and wider transport issues. Part of the plan is to increase awareness of the new roads being built in the borough in order to counter the misconception that new housing is being built without the necessary infrastructure – when in fact we are making what must be one of the largest investments in infrastructure the Borough has seen, with more than £100million allocated for new roads alone. The signs are one of the ways we are

increasing knowledge about the five major roads that are being built to mitigate the impact of new housing and improve the network.

You may also have noticed that we have significantly increased the volume and quality of our text, email and social media updates to keep people informed about road closures and other disruption – in order to help people plan journeys. We have also increased our promotion of non-car means of transport and will be increasing our efforts as the communication plan is further developed.

In relation to the school crossing patrollers, the signs were paid for from capital budget, which could not be used for revenue costs such as school crossing patrollers.

Supplementary Question

This question relates to one person making a financial decision which residents across the Borough think is a waste of money. Will you listen to residents and use their Council Tax to continue to provide services that they want and value, such as school crossing patrollers, rather than frivolous projects such as these signs?

Supplementary Answer

In relation to the issue about spending money on things that residents value, of course that is something we do all the time.

17. SHAREHOLDERS' REPORT

(Councillors Norman Jorgensen, Pauline Jorgensen, Philip Mirfin, Stuart Munro and Anthony Pollock declared personal interests in this item)

The Executive considered a report which provided the budget monitoring position and the operational update for the Council Owned Companies for the period ending 30 April 2018. The report gave details of progress relating to the Council's housing subsidiaries and Optalis which was the provider of choice for Adult Care services.

The Executive Member for Finance and Corporate Services went through the report and responded to Member questions.

In relation to the completion of the Fosters project it was confirmed that residents were now settled in their new homes and were happy with the facilities provided.

In relation to the operation of Optalis, it was confirmed that over the past seven years Optalis had delivered savings to the Council in the region of £6m.

RESOLVED that:

- 1) the budget monitoring position for the month ending 30 April 2018 be noted;
- 2) the operational update for the period to 30 April 2018 be noted.

18. COMPREHENSIVE AND EFFICIENT LIBRARY SERVICE

The Executive considered a report which set out the proposed arrangements for mitigating the impact on the Council and its statutory requirements for the provision of Library Services following notice being served by the Maiden Erlegh School to vacate the Maiden Erlegh School library site.

The Executive Member for Environment, Leisure and Libraries advised the meeting that the Council was continuing to meet its statutory duties to provide a comprehensive and efficient library service for all the residents of the Borough. Following the establishment of the Library Offer in 2016 the Council had implemented self-service in six libraries (with a 50% take-up), relocated the Arborfield library and provided an extra 17 hours of opening time across the Borough. The Council would also be opening new libraries in Shinfield and Arborfield as part of the Strategic Development Locations.

In relation to the closure of the Maiden Erlegh library, it was considered that most of the current service users would be able to relocate to nearby libraries as many residents already used more than one of the Borough's libraries. Residents unable to travel could be served by other means such as the Library home delivery service.

RESOLVED that:

- 1) arrangements to mitigate the impact on the Council and its statutory requirements for the provision of Library services following notice being served by the Maiden Erlegh School to vacate the Maiden Erlegh School library site, as set out in the report, be approved;
- 2) the book purchasing and staffing resource be redeployed across the remaining library sites.

19. WOKINGHAM PRIMARY SCHOOL PLACES STRATEGY 2018

The Executive considered a report setting out a Primary School Places Strategy for the period 2018-2028 which includes proposed actions to ensure that there were sufficient primary school places in the right areas to serve Wokingham Borough's growing communities, outside of the strategic development location associated areas.

The Executive Member for Children's Services informed the Executive that a key element of the new strategy was flexibility. This meant that the Council would be able to respond to fluctuations in demand for school places and ensure that enough places were provided in the right locations across the Borough. The strategy examined the need for additional school places in the short term (3 years), the medium term (5 years) and the long term (10 years). The medium and long term projections indicated the need for additional school places linked to the provision of new housing.

The strategy had been developed using a more scientific approach which meant more effective analysis of data on demand for school places. This meant that problems experienced in earlier years, when quick fixes had to be put in place, would not be repeated.

RESOLVED: That the Wokingham Borough Council Primary School Places Strategy 2018 to 2028 be adopted.

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
STANDARDS COMMITTEE
HELD ON 4 JULY 2018 FROM 7.00 PM TO 7.20 PM**

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Richard Dolinski (Vice-Chairman), Parry Batth, UllaKarin Clark, Dianne King and Imogen Shepherd-DuBey

Parish/Town Council Representatives:- Sally Gurney (Co-Optee, Wokingham Town Council)

Officers Present

Andrew Moulton, Monitoring Officer

Neil Carr, Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist

3. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted from Ken Miall.

Richard Dolinski chaired the meeting.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meetings of the Committee, held on 8 March and 13 June 2018, were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

5. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

6. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no public questions.

7. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

There were no Member questions.

8. PARISH / TOWN COUNCIL QUESTION TIME

There were no Parish or Town Council questions.

9. UPDATE ON COMPLAINTS AND FEEDBACK

The Committee considered a report, set out at Agenda pages 9 to 14, which provided an update on Code of Conduct complaints. The report stated that, since the previous report to the Committee, in January 2018, one new complaint had been received.

The new complaint related to the alleged conduct of a Member prior to a public meeting in March 2018. Following an initial meeting between the Monitoring Officer, Chairman of the Standards Committee and an Independent Person, an independent investigation had been conducted. The investigation had found no evidence of a breach of the Code of Conduct. Consequently, no further action was taken.

The Committee discussed any broader training/learning issues arising out of the report.

Imogen Shepherd-Dubey suggested that, in cases where no further action was taken, the complainant should receive a more detailed reply setting out the reasons why the alleged behaviour was not found to be in breach of the Code of Conduct. Following discussion, the

Committee agreed that the provision of greater detail on the reasons for a particular decision would help to make the process more transparent and robust.

In relation to the discussion at the previous meeting on the consultation exercise being carried out by the Committee on Standards in Public Life, the Monitoring Officer provided an update. The Committee on Standards in Public Life had carried out two roundtable events in April 2018. These events had highlighted a number of issues, including:

- The high level of variation in local authority Codes of Conduct;
- Consistency in the declaration of interests;
- Treatment of gifts and hospitality;
- Lack of stronger sanctions which undermined public confidence;
- Effectiveness of the Independent Person role;
- Increasing pressures on the Monitoring Officer;
- The importance of “culture” and the role of the Government in driving improvement.

It was expected that the Committee on Standards in Public Life would publish a report on Ethical Standards in Local Government later in 2018.

Members also considered the provision of a training session on Code of Conduct issues prior to the next meeting on 15 October 2018. This was considered to be useful as there were a number of new/inexperienced Members on the Committee.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) the update report on complaints and feedback be noted;
- 2) in relation to Code of Conduct cases where no further action was taken after the initial review, the Monitoring Officer provide more detailed feedback to complainants and other interested parties on the rationale for the decision;
- 3) the update on the review of Ethical Standards in Local Government, being carried out by the Committee on Standards in Public Life, be notes;
- 4) a Code of Conduct training session be held at 7pm on 15 October, with the Standards Committee meeting to start at 7.30pm.