



**WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**MINUTES OF COMMITTEE MEETINGS
FOR THE PERIOD**

8 October 2018 to 5 November 2018

Heather Thwaites

Heather Thwaites
Acting Chief Executive
Published on 14 November 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.
8 October 2018 IMD 34	5 - 6
10 October 2018 Planning Committee	7 - 14
15 October 2018 Standards Committee	15 - 16
17 October 2018 Schools Forum	17 - 24
17 October 2018 Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee	25 - 32
25 October 2018 Executive	33 - 48
31 October 2018 Personnel Board	49 - 50
31 October 2018 Personnel Board	51 - 52
1 November 2018 IMD 41	53 - 54
5 November 2018 IMD 36	55 - 56
5 November 2018 Community and Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee	57 - 62

This page is intentionally left blank

Decision made in the presence of:
Simon Price, Assistant Director Housing, Income and Assessments
Madeleine Shopland

INDIVIDUAL EXECUTIVE MEMBER DECISION RECORD SHEET IMD 2018/34
--

Title of the report	Consultation on Right to Buy Receipts
----------------------------	--

DECISION MADE BY Executive Member for Housing - Pauline Jorgensen
ACTION BY Director of Locality and Customer Services - Interim Sarah Hollamby
DECISION MADE ON 08 October 2018

Recommendation contained in the report

That the Executive Member for Housing approves the consultation response for submission.

Decision

RESOLVED: That the Executive Member for Housing approves the consultation response for submission.

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 comment
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

Report outlining the Council's response to the consultation questions

PUBLISHED ON: 09 October 2018

EFFECTIVE ON: 17 October 2018

CALL-IN PERIOD EXPIRES: 16 October 2018

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD ON 10 OCTOBER 2018 FROM 7.00 PM TO 10.30 PM**

Committee Members Present

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

Councillors Present and Speaking

Councillors: Prue Bray, Philip Houldsworth and Simon Weeks

Councillors Present

Councillors: Imogen Shepherd-DuBey and Clive Jones

Officers Present

Madeleine Shopland, Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist
Connor Corrigan, Lead Specialist, Planning Delivery & Compliance
Chris Easton, Lead Specialist, Transport, Drainage & Compliance
Mary Severin, Borough Solicitor
Justin Turvey, Planning Specialist
Kate Powell, Environmental Health

Case Officers Present

Laura Callan
Nick Chancellor
Katie Herrington
Alex Thwaites

36. APOLOGIES

An apology for absence was submitted from John Jarvis.

37. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

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

MEMBERS' UPDATE

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

38. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey declared a Personal Interest in Item 42 Application 180760 Winnersh Relief Road (Phase 2) on the grounds that she had participated in the redesign but maintained an open mind and would make a decision on the basis of the information received that evening.

39. APPLICATIONS TO BE DEFERRED AND WITHDRAWN ITEMS

There were no items to be deferred or withdrawn.

40. APPLICATION NO 181951 - LAND AT ARNETT AVENUE AND BARKHAM RIDE, RG40 4EE

Proposal: Full application for the proposed erection of 46 no. dwellings (10 houses, 36 flats) with associated parking and landscaping, following demolition of existing buildings.

Applicant: Wokingham Housing Limited

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application as set out in agenda pages 13 to 44.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- An amendment to the recommendation;
- An amendment to condition 8 to reflect amended working hours;
- Additional condition 27 regarding electric vehicle charging;
- Additional Informative 5 regarding the protection of trees;
- Correction of typographical error in paragraphs 11 and 27.

Roland Cundy, Finchampstead Parish Council, spoke in objection to the application. He stated that the Parish Council welcomed the affordable housing element of the scheme and the development of a Construction Environmental Management Plan. However, they had concerns regarding the potential impact of the demolition and construction on nearby residents. Roland Cundy questioned whether contractors and construction traffic would be able to park on site during the construction to lessen the impact on residents. He went on to ask whether consideration had been given to providing a temporary works access to the site from Barkham Ride.

Arch Thompson, resident, spoke in objection the application. He commented that the existing 2 storey buildings would be replaced by 3 storey buildings and that this would mean that his and other properties would potentially be overlooked and that privacy would be lost. There were no other 3 storey properties in the surrounding area. He believed that an increase in the number and size of windows in the proposed properties compared with the existing properties would exacerbate the issue of overlooking. Mr Thomson also raised concerns regarding excess noise and pressure on the infrastructure and suggested that the hours of construction be reduced further.

Carl Wilcox, resident, spoke in objection the application. He stated that his property backed on to the east block of the site. A proposed property would be 4.75m from the boundary of his property, down from a distance of 12m for the existing property. He felt that this would mean that his property would be overlooked.

Martin Gray, Living Architects, spoke in support of the application. He emphasised that the site would be centred around a new village green which was for the whole community. The height and width of the north and south blocks had been reduced and balconies had been removed from the east side.

Simon Weeks, Ward Member, spoke in support of the application. He stated that the third floor of the 3 storey properties would be built into the roof space so that they would effectively be 2.5 storey properties. He noted that distance requirements had either been met or exceeded across the site. He welcomed the development of a Construction Environmental Management Plan, the proposed infrastructure contribution, the meeting of parking standards and the retention of a number of mature trees. He requested that the Chairman and Ward Members be consulted with regards to condition 16, which related to a Construction Environmental Management Plan.

Members sought clarification regarding the distance between the site and neighbouring properties and the density of the site. The Case Officer commented that standards regarding separation distance, as detailed in the Borough Design Guide, had been met. Whilst there would be some overlooking of several properties, it was believed that this would not create an unacceptable level of harm.

Members questioned whether the provision of a temporary works access to the site from Barkham Ride had been considered. The Lead Specialist, Transport, Drainage & Compliance commented that this was unlikely to be an option. Visibility may be insufficient and the scrubbing of vegetation would be required. In addition an existing full signalised pedestrian crossing would need to be relocated. The Case Officer added that there were a number of high quality trees in the area and it was hoped that these would be retained for the long term.

A Member asked about bus access and was informed that the Number 3 bus went frequently throughout the week and that there were bus stops along Barkham Ride.

A Member questioned whether the building materials from the demolition could be recycled on site. The Lead Specialist, Planning Delivery & Compliance commented that this could be part of the Construction Environmental Management Plan. A Member went on to ask whether there could be a requirement for all vehicles associated with construction to remain on site during construction. The Lead Specialist, Transport, Drainage & Compliance emphasised that this could be difficult to enforce but efforts could be made to work with the applicant to achieve this.

In response to a Member question as to whether the bin area was of a sufficient size, particularly with the likely introduction of food waste collection in the future, the Lead Specialist, Planning Delivery & Compliance indicated that current standards had been met.

Members were pleased to note the level of affordable housing provision.

The Committee agreed that the Chairman and Ward Members should be consulted with regards to condition 16 (Construction Environmental Management Plan).

RESOLVED: That

- 1) application 181951 be approved subject to the completion of satisfactory planning obligations to secure SANG and SAMM contributions and conditions and informatives as set out in agenda pages 14 to 22, amended condition 8, new condition 27 and new informative 5 as set out in the Members' Update;
- 2) the Chairman and Ward Members be consulted with regards to condition 16 (Construction Environmental Management Plan).

41. APPLICATION NO 181658 - PARCEL C2 SECONDARY SCHOOL ACCESS ROAD ARBORFIELD GARRISON

Proposal: Reserved Matters application pursuant to Outline Planning Consent O/2014/2280 for the construction of 104 apartments, communal space (Clubhouse) and access from the Secondary School Access Road, with associated internal access roads, parking, landscaping and open space, footpaths/cycle ways, and Sustainable Urban Drainage (Parcel C2).

Applicant: Crest Nicholson Operations Limited C/O Savills

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application as set out in agenda pages 45 to 84.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- Correction of typographical error in the first paragraph of page 46 (report summary);
- Amended condition 2 to reflect the compilation of a list of plans for approval;
- Clarification regarding the updating of the Flood Risk Assessment and Phasing being considered under separate conditions applications.

Stuart Garnett, agent, spoke in support of the application. He highlighted the benefits of the private rental scheme and indicated that there would be a club house on site for use by residents. Parking standards had been met and a safety audit had not identified any issues. He thanked the Parish Councils for their input and engagement.

A Member asked about the provision of affordable housing at the proposed development. The Lead Specialist, Planning Delivery & Compliance explained that there would be an element of off-site provision. The government was seeking the production of different types of housing and the private rental scheme in the proposed location was a good use of space and would help to increase the population around the district centre, increasing its viability.

A Member noted that the site was located near a secondary school and questioned what action would be taken should others use the car park intended for the site. The Lead Specialist, Transport, Drainage & Compliance stated that the car park would be a private scheme and that condition 7 required a Parking Management Plan.

RESOLVED: That application 181658 be approved subject to conditions as set out in agenda pages 47 to 50 and the completion of S106 'Deed of Variation' agreement inclusive of the following Heads of Terms: 'Affordable Housing Provision – 35% provided as a commuted sum for off-site provision (Parcel C2 only)' and amended condition 2 as detailed in the Members' update.

42. APPLICATION NO 180760 - WINNERSH RELIEF ROAD (PHASE 2)

Proposal: Full planning application for the proposed development of relief road, connecting B3030 King Street Lane / Winnersh Relief Road Phase 1 to the A329 Reading Road including two new roundabout junctions on A329 Reading Road, two new minor residential access roads and associated works including traffic signals, crossings, drainage, footways and cycleways (road forms Phase 2 of Winnersh Relief Road and part of the western section of the Northern Distributor Road).

Applicant: Wokingham Borough Council

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- Clarification regarding consultation dates;
- Amendment to condition 8 Lower Earley Way/Rushey Way/Mill Lane Mitigation.

Paul Fishwick, Winnersh Parish Council, commented on the application. Whilst some of the Parish Council's concerns had been addressed, some still remained. He suggested

that Keep Clear markings be added at King Street Lane and that Keep Clear markings be added at Green Lane, where a toucan crossing was also required. He proposed a raised table crossing at Sandstone Close and commented that this was successfully in place in Lower Earley Way. A raised table crossing at Laburnum Close would also be beneficial. Paul Fishwick went on to state that the proposed new roundabout would potentially act as a barrier to non-motorised traffic and conflict with pedestrians and cyclists. He felt that the two roundabouts and limiting of turning movements for Woodward Close to left in and left out only would not be of benefit to residents or visitors. He suggested a toucan crossing on the southern arm and the relocation of the planned toucan crossing to the west. He also asked about the Air Quality Action Plan.

Rajveer Surdhar, resident, spoke in objection to the application, expressing concern regarding the proximity of the proposed roundabout to 286-290 Reading Road.

Richard Harrison (From Odyssey on behalf of Luff Developments Ltd) spoke in objection to the application. He was of the view that there had been a lack of suitable option testing. He questioned the safety of the proposed roundabout and commented that there would be a lack of visibility and that pedestrians and cyclists would potentially have to cross two lanes which was unsafe.

Ian Haller, on behalf of the applicant, spoke in support of the application. He indicated that some areas of the scheme had been amended following consultation.

Philip Houldsworth, Ward Member, spoke in support of the application. He commented that whilst some residents would be inconvenienced, the growing traffic levels needed to be addressed.

Prue Bray, Ward Member, spoke in support of the application and asked for consideration of the points made by the Parish Council and residents. She suggested that condition 5 be amended so that Ward Members also be consulted with, with regards to the Construction Environmental Management Plan. She also asked that the Construction Liaison Officer liaise with the Ward Members and Parish Council.

Members discussed the proposed amendments from Winnersh Parish Council. The Lead Specialist, Transport, Drainage & Compliance stated that Keep Clear markings could be picked up at the detailed design phase. Raised table crossings were dealt with under the separate Traffic Regulation Order process. However, discussions could be had with the Ward Members and Parish Council on this matter. He also stated that there had been debate around the benefits of roundabouts against traffic signals. Roundabouts were generally freer flowing and Reading Road had higher volumes of traffic at peak hours. The existing proposal was acceptable with regards to traffic requirements. A Member asked about timed traffic lights on roundabouts and was informed that this was not an ideal solution.

The Committee discussed the safety of cyclists and pedestrians.

With regards to air quality, Kate Powell, Environmental Health, stated that it was an air quality management area and there would be additional traffic. Actions would need to be put in place in the Air Quality Action Plan to improve the air quality.

A Member asked what traffic modelling had been carried out with regards to King Street Lane and the impact on the junction. The Lead Specialist, Transport, Drainage &

Compliance commented that various assessments and traffic surveys had been carried out. A Member asked about the existing zebra crossing on Kings Street Lane and was informed that it was not part of the scheme. A safety audit had been undertaken and no concerns had been raised.

The Committee agreed that condition 5 be amended so that the Chairman and Ward Members also be consulted with, with regards to the Construction Environmental Management Plan. Members also felt that an informative that Keep Clear markings be added at Green Lane and King Street Lane, should be added.

RESOLVED: That application 180760 be approved subject to conditions and informatives as set out in agenda pages 86 to 94, amended condition 8 as set out in the Members' Update, amended condition 5 and additional informative.

43. APPLICATION NO 181565 - EMMBROOK SCHOOL, WOKINGHAM, RG41 1JP

Proposal: Full planning application for proposed artificial grass pitch with flood lights.

Applicant: Wokingham Borough Council

The Committee received and reviewed a report regarding the application set out in agenda pages 137 to 162.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- Amendment to condition 5 regarding noise management.
- Amendment to paragraph 20 to include the words 'and rugby.'

Kevin Morgan, Wokingham Town Council, spoke in objection to the application. He stated that the hours of operation should be reduced. The site was closer to residential properties than other 3G pitches in the Borough but had proposed longer hours of operation. He went on to state that the noise assessment had not taken spectators, multiple matches being played at the same time, ball catch fences and traffic levels, into account. Guidance stated that the level at which noise was considered annoying was 35db to 40db, a reduction on 50db. Kevin Morgan also expressed concern regarding flooding and indicated that the site was on a flood plain. Run off water from the Matthewsgreen development would also drain into the Emm Brook. Increased traffic as a result of players and spectators travelling to matches and parking on the site was also highlighted.

Bob Millen, resident, spoke in objection to the application on behalf of Emmbrook Residents Association. He stated that the extended hours of operation would have a negative impact on neighbouring properties. He also expressed concern regarding the noise monitoring report which had not included full, competitive games. Bob Millen also commented that the noise management plan was vague and questioned how noise levels would be monitored sufficiently. He felt that there should be conditions about minimising the number of activities.

Paul O'Neill, applicant, spoke in support of the application. He was of the view that the proposal would be of benefit for young people and other members of the local community. Young people's health and wellbeing was important and the proposal would enable the offer of high quality sporting activity. He clarified that the pitch would be used by the school in particular between 7.30am and 5pm.

A Member questioned who would manage the site after 5pm. The Case Officer indicated that it would be managed by an external management company.

The Committee asked about the hours of operation, the impact of noise on residents and how noise levels would be monitored. Kate Powell, Environmental Health, confirmed that noise levels had been compared against 35db and she was satisfied that levels would not be unacceptable. She also commented that complaints tended to be around activities such as altercations and use of offensive language rather than noise levels. With regards to noise monitoring, the Planning Specialist indicated that there was a condition which required a noise monitoring supervisor. They would liaise with Environmental Health and neighbours over any issues and advise any particular teams if complaints had been received about their noise levels.

In response to Member questions regarding spectator numbers, the Case Officer indicated that large numbers of spectators were not anticipated. The Lead Specialist, Transport, Drainage & Compliance commented that the school would be using the site between 7.30am and 5pm and that it was anticipated that the car park could accommodate those parking outside school hours.

In response to Member questions regarding the potential risk of flooding, the Lead Specialist, Transport, Drainage & Compliance commented that a Flooding Risk Assessment had been submitted and reviewed. In addition proposed condition 7 related to drainage matters.

The Committee were of the view that during the evening the site would primarily be used by adults. Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey proposed that activity be restricted to non-competitive matches between the hours of 8pm and 10pm in order to reduce the noise impact on nearby residents.

Angus Ross questioned whether the hours of operation could be reviewed after a year to ascertain the impact on residents after 8pm. The Planning Specialist commented that an hours of operation management plan could be put in place. Angus Ross proposed that condition 3 be amended to require an hours of operation management plan. This was seconded by Malcolm Richards. This was put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED: That application 181565 be approved subject to conditions and informatives as set out in agenda pages 138 to 140, amended condition 5 as set out in the Members' Update and amended condition 3.

44. APPLICATION NO 182496 - LAND TO THE WEST OF THAMES VALLEY PARK, RG6 1PT

Proposal: Application to vary condition 2 (Approved plans) of planning permission 161596 for the proposed development of a Park and Ride facility providing approximately 277 vehicular spaces, motorcycle parking and associated vehicular access and landscaping) in order to alter finished ground levels/ retaining walls, and the layout of parking spaces, bus stop and bus turning area.

Applicant: Wokingham Borough Council

The Committee received and reviewed a report regarding the application set out in agenda pages 163 to 193.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- Earley Town Council comments and officer response.

Michael Firmager, Earley Town Council, spoke in objection to the application. The Town Council were of the view that although the proposal may reduce traffic entering Reading Borough, Earley would not be benefited. Michael Firmager commented that the high wall would have a detrimental visual impact on the surrounding area and may also result in unsafe, dark areas in the car park.

The Case Officer emphasised that the wall would not create dark areas within the car park. In response to a Member question regarding enhanced planting and its upkeep Officers indicated that the Council was the landowner.

RESOLVED: That application 182496 be approved subject to conditions and informatives as set out in agenda pages 164 to 171.

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
STANDARDS COMMITTEE
HELD ON 15 OCTOBER 2018 FROM 7.30 PM TO 7.40 PM**

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Ken Miall (Chairman), Parry Batth, Dianne King and Imogen Shepherd-DuBey

Town and Parish Councillors Present

Councillors: Sally Gurney and Roy Mantel

Officers Present

Andrew Moulton, Monitoring Officer
Mary Severin, Deputy Monitoring Officer
Jennifer Lee, Senior Solicitor
Neil Carr, Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist

10. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted from UllaKarin Clark and Richard Dolinski.

Paddy Haycocks (Independent Person) was also in attendance.

11. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 4 July 2018 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

12. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

13. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no public questions.

14. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

There were no Member questions.

15. PARISH / TOWN COUNCIL QUESTION TIME

There were no questions from Parish or Town Councillors.

16. UPDATE ON COMPLAINTS AND FEEDBACK

The Committee considered a report, set out at Agenda pages 7 to 12, which provided an update on new Code of Conduct complaints reported since the previous meeting of the Committee on 4 July 2018.

The report stated that five new complaints had been received in that period. Appendix A to the report provided a summary of the complaints. The complaints related to a range of issues including Member conduct at public meetings, comments on social media and a planning matter.

The report also gave details of the powers available to the Monitoring Officer to investigate and resolve complaints. Under the Council's Constitution the Monitoring Officer had delegated authority to decide whether complaints:

- a) Could be resolved informally, e.g. by mediation;
- b) Required investigation;
- c) Should be referred to the Standards Committee;
- d) Did not require any further action to be taken.

Andrew Moulton, Monitoring Officer, confirmed that more detailed feedback would be provided to complainants and other interested parties in cases where no further action was to be taken.

The Committee considered any trends amongst the complaints and any training and/or communication issues arising. Members also considered any matters arising from the Member training session held before the meeting.

RESOLVED: That the update report on complaints and feedback on Code of Conduct issues be noted.

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
SCHOOLS FORUM
HELD ON 17 OCTOBER 2018 FROM 10.00 AM TO 11.50 AM**

Schools Representatives

Helen Ball	Primary Head - Polehampton Infant
Emma Clarke	Primary Head - Farley Hill
Sally Hunter	Primary Head - Wescott Infant
Elaine Stewart	Primary Head - Aldryngton Primary
Sharon Finn	Primary Head – Lambs Lane (as a substitute for Emma Clark)
Sylvia Allen	School Business Manager - Hawkedon Primary
Julia Mead	School Business Manager - St Sebastian's CE Primary
Carol Simpson	School Business Manager - Colleton Primary
Ginny Rhodes	Secondary Head - St Crispins
Paul O'Neill	Secondary Head - Embrook
Janet Perry	Academy Business Manager - The Holt School
Corrina Gillard	Headteacher - Emmbrook Infant School
Kerrie Clifford	Maintained Nursery Acting Headteacher
Jay Blundell	Pupil Referral Unit Headteacher - Foundry College
Sara Attra	Special School Head - Addington School
Paul Miller	Governor - St Crispins - Chairman

Non School Representatives

Shahid Younis WBC Representative

Also Present

Luciane Bowker, Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist
Coral Miller, Interim Senior Finance Specialist, Schools
Lynne Samuel, Senior Finance Specialist, People Services
Bob Watson, Lead Specialist, Finance

1 ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

Paul Miller was elected Chairman for the 2018/19 academic year.

2 ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

John Bayes was appointed Vice-Chairman for the 2018/19 academic year.

3 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted from Ali Brown, Maggie Callaghan, Carol Cammiss, Derren Gray, Jim Levers, Brian Prebble, James Taylor and Marion Standing.

The Chairman explained that both Carol Cammiss, Director of Children's Services and Jim Levers, Interim Director of Children's Services had been unable to attend this meeting due to the fact that the service was currently undergoing an Ofsted inspection.

4 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 18 July 2018 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

5 MATTERS ARISING

Governor vacancy

The Chairman stated that as a result of Ian Head, governor representative, stepping down, there was now a primary school representative vacancy in the Forum. The Forum was informed that this vacancy could be filled by a headteacher, a governor or a school business manager, and it was up to the primary phase to appoint someone. Corrina Gillard agreed to raise this with the primary phase and keep the Forum informed.

Early Years feedback

Gail Prewett informed that a meeting between Early Years providers and the local authority had taken place and this had been very positive. There was now more clarity as to how services were being charged and how support was going to be delivered.

Kerry Clifford agreed that it was positive that communication was improving and this should continue. She expressed disappointment that not many providers had been present at a recent meeting arranged specifically for leader of the Early Years settings.

School Admissions benchmarking and cost of legal challenges

The Chairman stated that Jim Leviers had indicated that the service did not have the resources to carry out this research. Schools Forum had the option of asking for this piece of work to be commissioned. The Chairman suggested and the Forum agreed to defer the discussion of this possibility to the next meeting when it was hoped that Jim Leviers would be able to attend and discuss the idea in more detail.

High Needs Block (HNB) Task and Finish Group

Ginny Rhodes expressed great concern over the lack of progress in tackling the HNB difficulties. She stated that this state of inertia added to the pressure on funding and ultimately impacted the children for whom the local authority had responsibility.

The Chairman stated that Patricia Davies, former Interim Assistant Director of Education had identified two strands of work. One was at the strategic level, looking over a longer horizon at building/commissioning new specialist schools and increasing resource places; the second, reflecting Schools Forum's responsibilities, was looking at addressing the short and medium term HNB funding and expenditure programme.

The following points were made during the discussion of the HNB:

- Members of Schools Forum recognised that there had been many changes at senior leadership level, however, there was an urgent need to put a strategic plan in place to address this difficult situation;
- Janet Perry questioned if there was a link between the multiple changes in leadership and the HNB difficulties;
- Janet Perry would like to know who was responsible for the HNB situation. She stated that Schools Forum had been criticized by the previous Director of Children's Services for not tackling the expenditure challenges, however, Schools Forum's powers were limited and its responsibilities did not extend to executive decision making;
- Councillor Younis stated that there was no blame culture in the Council and that a collective effort was being made to address these challenges;
- Corrina Gillard stated that problems with the HNB had been identified a several years ago and that it was frustrating that no action had been taken to tackle them. She stated that Jane Winterbone, former Interim Assistant Director of Education had commissioned a Resource Place Review (late 2017/early 2018) and it was disappointing that no action had been taken as a result;

- Sara Attra expressed frustration that she was unable to communicate with the local authority about resource base places and funding for those places;
- Jay Blundell stated that it had been agreed that Foundry College would be expanded, with an increase of places from 47 to 85, however, it was not clear where the base funding for these additional places was going to come from, and she had been unable to speak to anyone from the local authority to confirm the funding;
- Councillor Younis reassured members that work was being undertaken to address these challenges;
- Bob Watson, Lead Finance Specialist stated that the pressure on HNB was being faced by many local authorities nationally. The Council recognised that having interim staff in strategic leadership posts had not helped the situation and the Council was looking to redress this situation. Bob Watson commented that Wokingham had faced difficulty in recruiting permanent staff, with one reason given that the Borough did not qualify for London weighting;
- Schools Forum members expressed serious concern and frustration that the HNB was not being managed properly and that whenever this was questioned the local authority repeated the same unsatisfactory explanations;
- Sara Attra stated that another issue was the lack of data, there was no information about how many children were expected to need specialist places;
- The Chairman stated that it was important to continue the financial planning undertaken by the HNB Task and Finish Group and to involve Schools Forum members in the strategic planning.

Councillor Younis agreed to investigate the issues raised by Schools Forum outside the meeting.

6 DECLARATION OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

7 REVENUE MONITORING REPORT

Coral Miller, Interim Senior Finance Specialist, Schools went through the 2018/19 Schools Revenue Monitoring report which was set out in Agenda pages 18-22.

Coral Miller stated that the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) shortfall had increased by £260k from that reported to Schools Forum in July, with a year-end deficit of £1.853m now anticipated.

Coral Miller explained that the HNB pressure continued, with a further adverse movement of £130k. This was mainly due to nine more commissioned places in post-16 Out of Borough provision at £6k per place which reduced the HNB income by £54k. An additional five places in a local maintained special school to help reduce the reliance on Out of Borough placements and increases in “top up” funding further increased unplanned expenditure by £76k.

Coral Miller stated that the HNB deficit was now forecast at £1.731m by the end of the 2018/19 financial year. A Special Educational Needs (SEN) Strategy Group had been established, chaired by the Assistant Director for Education, with input from Finance, Strategic Commissioning and relevant schools. The group were considering service planning in light of pressure on resources and would identify all possible action for delivering a balanced budget position and reduce deficit.

Coral Miller stated that the expenditure in the Central Services Block had also increased, with an overspend of £125k now anticipated. This was as a result of further DfE guidance over copyright licences for both academies and schools which from 2018/19 need to be funded from this block.

Coral Miller reported a small increase in the provision for Growth Fund of £5k.

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

- Janet Perry asked if refunds from previous years were expected. Lynne Samuel, Senior Finance Specialist, People Services explained that the Department for Education (DfE) had confirmed that this was not expected;
- The Chairman stated that the predicted 1.4% overspend of the overall Budget represented a 10% overspend in the HNB;
- Carol Simpson asked why school contingency had gone up. Coral Miller explained that this related to underspends in the de-delegated schools specific contingency last year that had been carried forward, however the provision for maternity/paternity cover had been reduced due to overspends last year in this area.

RESOLVED That the report be noted.

8 DE-DELEGATED SCHOOLS CONTINGENCY

Coral Miller went through the De-delegated Schools Contingency report which was set out in Agenda pages 23-25, she stated that this related to maintained schools only.

Coral Miller explained that schools with exceptional circumstances could apply for funding from this contingency and Finance would visit the school to understand their unique situation. Any funding granted from this contingency was subject to approval by the Assistant Director of Children's Services.

Coral Miller stated that there had been one claim made on the contingency this year which had been approved. This was for a school that had been involved in a confidential investigation of a senior staff member. The school had provided a detailed breakdown of the costs and requested a contribution of £43k which the local authority agreed to.

RESOLVED That the report be noted.

9 FINAL SETTLEMENT FOR EARLY YEARS AND HIGH NEEDS BLOCK

Coral Miller presented the Final Settlement for the Early Years and High Needs Block report which was set out in Agenda pages 28-31.

Coral Miller stated that the report provided information on additional allocations made to Early Years providers, following confirmation of the DfE recoupment figure. She informed that the estimated number of children used to calculate the Budget funding had been greater than the actual number of children in the Early Years phase during the financial year 2017/18. This difference (fewer) in children numbers led to the recoupment. The Finance team had anticipated a recoupment for the year and had intentionally set aside sufficient funding from the Early Years Block Budget to settle the recoupment without impact upon providers. The level of funding set aside was sufficient to settle the recoupment and to allow a small further distribution of funds to providers.

Coral Miller stated that providers would receive a further distribution of £0.16p per hour in relation to the 2017/18 balance of 'set aside' Early Years funding.

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

- Ian Morgan asked if the £707,350 included the £229k expected growth;
- Coral Miller stated that this was part of the 96% funding that was passported to providers;
- Kerry Clifford stated that it was impossible to know how many people would take up the 30 hours of free childcare for working parents;
- Ian Morgan pointed out that the birth rate was dropping;
- Coral Miller stated that the growth provision was for 93 children, if this was subsequently not taken up, the local authority would have to give back the difference;
- Ian Morgan stated that it was important to be transparent about the process but thanked the officers for their diligence and support.

RESOLVED That the report be noted.

10 2019-20 SCHOOLS BUDGET UPDATE\CHANGES

Coral Miller presented the 2019/20 DfE Summary Budget update report which was set out in agenda pages 34-38.

Coral Miller stated that the DfE guidance was issued in July and provided an indication of budgets for the upcoming financial year. The information showed the estimated DSG for Schools Block and HNB for 2019/20. These figures would be subject to change and the actual DSG allocation would be announced just before the end of December 2018.

Coral Miller informed that a Schools Block Task and Finish Group had been 'recalled' to review the Schools Block allocation and work through options in more detail.

Coral Miller went through the changes listed in the report. She highlighted that the local funding formula would continue for 2021, the New Funding Formula would not be implemented until (at least) after that date.

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

- Carol Simpson was of the opinion the Schools Forum were unlikely to approve a request to passport money from the Schools Block to the HNB, unless a robust strategic plan was implemented;
- Janet Perry asked that papers and up to date information be circulated in advance of future Task and Finish Groups meetings to enable a more constructive discussion;
- Coral Miller stated that due to the sensitivity of the data for the Task and Finish Group, and to ensure just the Group saw the option, it would not be possible to email this information before the meeting, however Coral confirmed that she would find a way of providing this information to the Group before the Task and Finish Group meeting;
- Coral Miller stated that the figures used in the models could not be 100% accurate, the DfE would confirm the actual allocation in late December;
- Members asked for confirmation of which new schools would open next September. It was agreed that Piers Brunning, Strategy and Commissioning (People and Places) Senior Specialist would be invited to attend the next meeting to clarify the questions raised in relation to new schools;

- Members urged the local authority to be mindful of the impact of opening new schools to existing local schools in respect of pupil numbers;
- In response to a question Coral Miller stated that Budget would be discussed in December and January, the final submission was on 21 January 2019;
- Coral Miller informed that she would be attending a DfE conference the next day and that there were many points that she wished to clarify. She would report back to Schools Forum on her findings after the conference.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) Piers Brunning would be invited to attend the next meeting to inform the Forum about the processes around opening new schools and expanding existing schools;
- 2) The Schools Block Task and Finish Group would meet and discuss different models and report back to Schools Forum at its meeting in December with a proposed model;
- 3) The report be noted.

11 FORWARD PROGRAMME

The Forum considered and noted the Forward Programme of work and dates of future meetings as set out on Agenda page 39.

The Chairman pointed out that there were changes to the calendar of meetings and explained that the *27 February* and *15 May 2019* meetings were cancelled as they were deemed unnecessary.

The meeting on 27 March 2019 was moved to 6 March 2019.

12 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Teachers pay grant

Coral Miller stated that to support the pay award for September 2018-March 2019 the DfE had allocated a grant called the Teachers Pay Grant. The rates would be £16.40 per pupil for primary schools, £26.54 per pupil for secondary school and £65.65 per place for special schools.

Coral Miller stated that the estimated figure for the financial year 2019/20 were £28.29 per primary school pupil, £45.56 per secondary school pupil and £113.46 per special school place. She clarified that Wokingham did not qualify for London fringe allowance.

It was agreed that the details of the amount per pupil and a link to the website would be included with the minutes.

In response to a question Coral Miller stated that she would check if PRUs were included. *Coral has since confirmed that PRU's are included.*

The link below contains the information requested by Schools Forum:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/teachers-pay-grant-methodology/teachers-pay-grant-methodology>

Pensions

Schools Forum was informed that there was going to be an increase in employee contributions September 2020-23, the rates had gone up to 23.6%, representing a 7% increase. The DfE had committed to help until 2019/20, after that there would be a Spending Review 2019/20. Coral Miller asked schools to factor this cost into their budgets. *Subsequently Coral informed that the DfE said that they would fund a 100% for the first year 2019/20 of the costs.*

In response to a question Lynne Samuel stated that there was a degree of uncertainty in relation to future grants/support, pending the outcomes of the Spending Review 2019.

Business rates

Coral Miller stated that in previous years the Council had funded the difference between budgeted and actual costs, but this would not be possible going forward, as the Local Authority could not hold contingency from the Schools Block Budget, 100% of this funding needed to be allocated to schools and academies.

In response to a question Coral Miller stated that the worse affected school was going to have to pay £50k, but the average was between £1k and £6k.

Bob Watson stated that business rates were set by the central government and the local authority was merely the collecting agency.

Janet Perry pointed out that academies, who had charity status, paid much reduced business rates in relation to maintained schools.

Free school meals

Coral Miller agreed to look into the increase and report back to the Forum.

The link below contains the information requested by Schools Forum:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/free-school-meals-supplementary-grant-2018-to-2019>

Catering contract

Sylvia Allen stated that it had recently come to light that the Council was paid 12 pence per school meal to administer the catering contract, this amounted to a significant amount of money. There had been a lack of transparency as schools were previously not aware of this and it was not understood how this money was spent. She reported that as a result many schools were considering pulling out of the contract.

The Chairman noted that Schools Forum guidelines and responsibilities required the Council to bring the details of any contract for school to Schools Forum before the contract was tendered.

Coral Miller and Lynne Samuel would look into this and report back to the December Schools Forum.

Schools Forum Guidance

The Chairman asked members to read the recently updated online resources in relation to Schools Forum.

Schools Forum Powers and Responsibilities:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/740721/Schools_forum_powers_and_responsibilities.docx.odt

He stated that there was also a self-assessment available, which will be discussed at the next Schools Forum with a view to using it to assess Schools Forum's effectiveness.

Schools Forum Self Assessment Toolkit:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/647443/Schools_forum_self-assessment_toolkit.odt

Other relevant guides can be found at the link:

<https://www.gov.uk/search?q=Schools+Forum>

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE HELD ON 17 OCTOBER 2018 FROM 7.00 PM TO 9.00 PM

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Parry Batth (Chairman), Philip Houldsworth (Vice-Chairman), Andy Croy, Mike Haines, Ken Miall, Ian Pittock, Malcolm Richards, Shahid Younis and Clive Jones

Officers Present

Peter Baveystock, Service Manager, Cleaner, Greener and Reactive Highway Services
Neil Carr, Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist

46. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted from Lindsay Ferris, Kate Haines and Bill Soane.

Clive Jones attended the meeting as a substitute.

47. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 19 September 2018 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

48. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

49. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

In accordance with the agreed procedures the Chairman invited members of the public to submit questions.

49.1 Gillian Elward asked the Chairman the following question:

Most flexible plastic can be recycled. There are facilities in the UK for recycling polyethylene-based plastic (i.e. carrier bags, bread bags, cling film, bubble wrap, magazine wrappers etc. etc.). This makes up a significant proportion of consumer plastic packaging.

- I. Can the re3 partnership consider collecting and recycling this type of plastic? (ref Oxford City Council);
- II. Most large supermarkets collect carrier bags (so other PE-based plastics can be collected and recycled via this waste stream), but this is not widely known. Can re3/the Marketing and Communications Office include this information in their communications campaign?"

Answer

- I. In February this year we significantly extended the amounts of plastic materials we collect from the kerbside which included pots, tubs and trays. The additions made in February were introduced, taking into account sustainable recycling markets and the practicalities and cost of sorting. The Oxford City scheme has been extended to include a number of non-rigid plastics and at some stage in the future, other materials could be added to WBC's scheme if the criteria is met.
- II. The Council currently promotes the fact that most large supermarkets collect carrier bags but will look at our current programme and re-evaluate if necessary.

Supplementary Question

A small quick win would be to educate the public more about the recycling of polyethylene-based plastics via local supermarkets. Can this be pursued?

Supplementary Answer

Your suggestion is noted and will be investigated.

50. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

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

50.1 Gary Cowan asked the Chairman the following question:

Can you ensure that Ward Members are informed as to the grass cutting schedule in their wards and the actual areas scheduled to be cut in advance of the actual scheduled cut?

Answer

The new Contract was not built around schedules but was based on outcomes in that designated frequent cut areas would never be longer than 125mm. Whilst there is no specific schedule, our contractors follow a set grass cutting route which enables us to tell how they are progressing within different wards. With this information, last year we started a weekly update for Ward Members, during the growing period, in which we gave them grass cutting activities across the borough so they could see how this was progressing and relate it to their particular area.

Supplementary Question

Whoever carries out the grass cutting has to develop a programme supported by a schedule to ensure that the work is carried out in the correct locations. Can that schedule be made available to Members? This would provide greater clarity and transparency and reduce the level of contact between Members and the Cleaner and Greener team. Can the circulation of this information be looked at?

Supplementary Answer

The contractor does follow set routes. This information was made available on line last year and we will endeavour to do the same in 2019.

Peter Fry (Tivoli Area Manager) commented that the contractor was reviewing the routes, rounds and schedules for next year. The company was introducing a new electronic system into the Wokingham service which would provide updated information on the progress made by grass-cutting teams along their set routes. It was hoped to link this system with the Council's IT system thereby making it possible to provide more accurate information which, in turn, would reduce the number of calls to the contractor and WBC seeking updates on progress.

50.2 Ian Pittock asked the Chairman the following question:

The Parliamentary Committee on local government scrutiny recommended, in December 2017, that the annual Council budget is scrutinised throughout its development. Why has scrutiny of the Council Budget 2019/20 not been included in the Forward Programme for O&SMC?

Answer

The Council's Constitution already empowers the Overview and Scrutiny Committees to scrutinise the Council's Budget. Paragraph 6.2.3.1 states that the Community and Corporate Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee is responsible for scrutinising, reviewing and assisting with the policy development of the Council's Budget and Policy Framework.

At its meeting on 1 October 2018 the Committee considered how it would carry out its Budget Scrutiny role. The Committee resolved (inter alia) as follows:

"The January 2019 Committee item on monitoring of the Council's Revenue and Capital expenditure include a review of the quarterly revenue and capital monitoring reports, with a view to completing a review of the Budget setting process during the next municipal year".

Supplementary Question

When you say "Budget setting process" do you mean the administrative process or the actual development of the Budget itself?

Supplementary Answer

The Committee will decide on its work programme but my understanding is that it will be seeking to scrutinise the key issues, themes and Budget pressures facing the Council. This will be a more rigorous review looking backwards and forwards to the development of the Budget for 2020/21.

51. REVIEW OF THE GROUNDS MAINTENANCE CONTRACT

The Committee considered a report, set out at Agenda pages 11 to 16, which gave details of the Committee's ongoing review of the Council's Grounds Maintenance contract.

The report reminded Members that the review was considered at its 1 August and 19 September 2018 meetings. Following the Committee's Call for Evidence a number of residents, community groups and Town and Parish Councils had submitted written feedback on the operation of the service. The report set out the key themes arising from the evidence submitted to date relating to consultation, frequency of grass cutting, flexibility in the contract, communication with stakeholders, long grass and wildflower areas.

The following witnesses attended the meeting to provide information and answer Member questions:

- Peter Baveystock – WBC Service Manager, Cleaner and Greener Services;
- Emma Pilgrim – WBC Performance Officer, Cleaner and Greener Services;
- Peter Fry – Area Manager, Tivoli Group Ltd.

During the ensuing discussion Members raised the following issues.

What steps were Tivoli taking to improve the quality of service provided and learn lessons from the 2018 grass cutting season.

Peter Fry stated that a number of improvements had been implemented to improve standards and tackle issues arising earlier in the year. As an example, Tivoli would not be reducing staffing levels during the winter which meant that the service would be fully resourced in terms of personnel and skill sets for the start of the 2019 grass cutting season in March/April. Tivoli were also looking at the routes used by grass cutting teams and the machinery available as well as measures to improve supervision and productivity.

Would Tivoli be addressing issues relating to grass/weed growth in road gutters and drains?

Peter Baveystock confirmed that this issue was covered by the street cleansing contract. Specific issues could be addressed if Members provided location details.

Tivoli had taken over the grounds maintenance contract from ISS. What added skills/resources/investment would Tivoli be able to deliver?

Peter Fry stated that Tivoli was a new business and would bring a more local focus than ISS which was a large multinational organisation. This meant that Tivoli would be more responsive and agile and able to make investment decisions more effectively.

Tivoli was introducing new mobile systems for staff. Was there any resistance from staff in using these new systems and hand-held devices?

Peter Fry gave examples of the new systems in relation to staff bulletins, electronic forms and payslips. Staff were supportive of the new systems as they reduced the time previously spent on paperwork.

How did the Tivoli contract differ between Wokingham and the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (RBWM)?

Peter Fry commented that the Wokingham contract allowed more flexibility as it was more output focussed. RBWM officers spent more time on inspection and contract management activities. The Wokingham contract allowed more room for innovation and flexible solutions. Peter Baveystock commented that the new Localities team would be involved in the monitoring of the service and would be involved in quarterly contract meetings from 2109.

Were there any plans to develop greater feedback from local community groups and Town and Parish Councils?

Peter Baveystock commented that there were plans to improve local intelligence and feedback on service delivery linked to new Localities service. Officers would also be exploring options for mutual support with the three Town Councils.

How would Tivoli address the problems caused by grass "clumps" which were unsightly, blocked drains and prevented the casual use of informal green spaces?

Peter Baveystock stated that aim was to carry out regular cuts (every 4-5 weeks) which would keep the grass at a reasonable length and prevent "clumping". Peter Fry commented on Tivoli's investment in new machinery which would make it more difficult for clumping when the grass was cut.

What level of savings had been delivered to WBC when the new contract was let?

Peter Baveystock confirmed that the Council would make ongoing savings of £140k per annum compared to the previous base Budget. The joint procurement process with RBWM had delivered a saving of £40k.

How was the contract monitored by WBC staff?

Emma Pilgrim stated that the WBC client team carried out regular inspections and monitored the suite of Key Performance Indicators and Key Management Indicators. The Council's Dynamics system also generated information on complaints and customer satisfaction. Peter Fry commented that data from the Dynamics system was used by Tivoli to respond to complaints. The Localities team would be using hand held devices which linked in to the Dynamics system. Members were invited to view the operation of the Dynamics system from the client and contractor perspective.

The Chairman thanked the witnesses for their contributions and explained the next steps in the Scrutiny review process. A draft report would be produced and circulated to Members for comment before the November meeting of the Committee. The final draft would then be submitted to that meeting for final sign off by the Committee.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) Peter Fry, Peter Baveystock and Emma Pilgrim be thanked for attending the meeting to answer Member questions;
- 2) a draft Scrutiny report and recommendations on the Grounds Maintenance contract be circulated to members of the Committee for discussion and comment;
- 3) a final draft of the Scrutiny report be submitted to the 21 November 2018 meeting for sign off by the Committee.

52. WASTE AND RECYCLING UPDATE

The Committee considered a report, set out at Agenda pages 17 to 54, which gave details of the Council's plans to achieve the 50% waste and reuse target included in the 2008 EU Waste Framework Directive. The 50% target had been introduced into UK law and would remain in place following Brexit. The report stated that, at its meeting on 23 May 2018, the Committee had set out a number of questions relating to the corporate waste and recycling indicators and requested a more in-depth report on waste and recycling.

Peter Baveystock (Service Manager, Cleaner and Greener Services) and Irum Gulzar (Waste Reduction Officer) gave a presentation with responses to the earlier questions from the Committee. The report also included the re3 Strategy for 2018/20 which had been approved by the Council's Executive at its meeting on 27 September 2018.

In relation to the earlier questions raised by the Committee the following points were raised.

What was the breakdown between residual waste sent to landfill and waste to energy?

Peter Baveystock provided the following performance data:

	2015/16 Tonnes	2016/17 Tonnes	2017/18 Tonnes
Energy from Waste	28, 138 (72%)	29,917 (77%)	32,657 (86%)
Landfill	11,053 (28%)	9,240 (23%)	5,378 (14%)

What were the cost implications of the measures proposed to move the Council to the 50% recycling target by 2020?

Peter Baveystock confirmed that the introduction of food waste recycling (April 2019) would add approximately 7% to WBC's overall recycling figure (currently around 40%). In addition, the collection of pots, tubs, trays, foil and cartons (from February 2018) was expected to add 1.5% to 2%. It was also estimated that 0.5% to 1% would be generated by increasing the number of glass banks to 50 across the Borough by 2020. Finally, a further 1.5% to 2% would be generated by reducing the level of contamination in our kerbside recycling.

In terms of the financial implications of these measures, the increased revenue costs to cover an extra crew member and new vehicles would be £500k. This would be offset by the savings from diverting approximately 5,000 tonnes from landfill/energy from waste to anaerobic digestion.

Was there a net cost for the green waste service or did the service break even?

Peter Baveystock confirmed that the chargeable green waste service was a break-even service taking into account collection costs, administration costs, containers and container distribution.

Some Welsh Councils achieved recycling levels of 70%. Was this due to a more innovative approach or a different reporting system?

Irum Gulzar gave details of the strategic approach to waste and recycling adopted by the Welsh Government. The Welsh Government's 2010 document Towards Zero Waste (TZW) was the overarching waste strategy document for Wales. Wales was the only administration in the UK to have introduced statutory local authority recovery targets for waste recycling. The Welsh Government adopted a "carrot and stick approach" with a combination of Capital funding support and penalties for non-achievement of statutory targets. It was also noted that, of the 22 Welsh local authorities, 16 had fortnightly collections, five had three weekly collections and one had a four-weekly collection.

What was the impact on recycling of the significant reduction in printed newspapers, magazines, etc.?

Peter Baveystock provided the following performance data:

Material	Mar-Aug 2017 Tonnes	Mar-Aug 2018 Tonnes	Movement
News/Pamphlets	1,847	2,193	+19%
Mixed Paper	4,985	3,882	-22%
Card	1,216	1,650	+36%

Could wet material, such as newspaper, card, etc. be recycled or was it sent to landfill?

Peter Baveystock confirmed that wet materials such as paper, card, etc. could not be recycled as the fibres started to decompose. Wet materials were rejected and sent to energy from waste.

What were the cost and service implications of adding lids to the recycling black boxes?

Peter Baveystock confirmed that the cost of introducing lids for the black boxes would be around £200k. The additional costs of removal and emptying were estimated at between £250k and £500k. A more cost effective approach was a communications programme encouraging residents to store recycling under cover until collection. It was also suggested that putting the blue bags on top of the recycling boxes helped to keep the recycle dry.

What was the current position in relation to charging for DIY waste at Longshot Lane and Smallmead?

Peter Baveystock confirmed that DIY waste was not classified as household waste and the Council's policy was to continue to levy a charge. It was felt that this was still a much cheaper option than hiring a skip or Hippo bag.

Were there any plans to introduce the kerbside collection of glass?

Peter Baveystock confirmed that achieving a 1% improvement in glass recycling, by introducing kerbside collection, would cost around £600k to £800k per annum. Consequently, the Council's focus was on improving performance by increasing the number of bottle banks across the Borough to 50 by 2020. Members were asked to consider potential sites for new bottle banks within their wards.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) Peter Baveystock and Irum Gulzar be thanked for attending the meeting to answer Member questions;
- 2) the re3 Waste Strategy for 2018/20 be noted;
- 3) the Committee receive a further update on progress towards the 50% recycling target in the autumn of 2019;
- 4) any suggestions for new bottle bank sites be forwarded to the Cleaner and Greener team.

53. COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMMES

The Committee considered its forward work programme and that of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees as set out on Agenda pages 55 to 66.

In relation to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee meeting on 21 November 2018 – it was proposed that the item on 21st Century Council be deferred to the 17 January 2019 meeting due to the significant items which had to be considered at the November meeting. It was suggested that the Chairman give further consideration to the items to be considered at the 21 November meeting.

In relation to the Community and Corporate Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting on 5 November 2018 – it was confirmed that the Chairman had decided to defer the item on Wokingham Town Centre Regeneration to the 14 January 2019 meeting. This was due to the fact that key reports relating to lessons learnt from the Market Place project and the final safety audit would not be available until December 2018. It was felt that the public availability of these reports would be essential in order to facilitate an effective Scrutiny discussion. It was suggested that an update report on the Market Place Regeneration project be submitted to the 5 November meeting with a further detailed Scrutiny session to be held on Town Centre Regeneration at the 14 January 2019 meeting.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) the Overview and Scrutiny Committee future work programmes be noted;
- 2) the Chairman review the number and priority of items to be considered at the next meeting of the Management Committee;
- 3) the Community and Corporate Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee consider an update report on the Market Place Regeneration Project at its meeting on 5 November 2018 followed by a detailed Scrutiny session on Wokingham Town Centre Regeneration at its meeting on 14 January 2019.

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF
THE EXECUTIVE
HELD ON 25 OCTOBER 2018 FROM 7.30 PM TO 8.25 PM**

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Charlotte Haitham Taylor (Chairman), Richard Dolinski, Pauline Helliars-Symons, Norman Jorgensen, Pauline Jorgensen, Philip Mirfin, Stuart Munro, Anthony Pollock and Simon Weeks

Other Councillors Present

Prue Bray
Rachel Burgess
Lindsay Ferris
David Hare
Clive Jones
Ian Pittock
Imogen Shepherd-DuBey
Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey

61. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence received.

62. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the Extraordinary Executive Meetings held on 17 September and 20 September 2018 and the Executive Meeting held on 27 September 2018 were confirmed as correct records and signed by the Leader of Council.

63. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Councillor Norman Jorgensen declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 64 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 64 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.

Councillors Philip Mirfin and Anthony Pollock declared personal interests in Agenda Item 64 Shareholders' Report by virtue of the fact that they were paid Non-Executive Directors of Optalis Holdings Ltd. Councillors Mirfin and Pollock remained in the meeting during discussions and voted on the matter.

64. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

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

64.1 Paul Fishwick asked the Executive Member for Highways and Transport the following question:

Question

I first reported Street Light number 5 Robin Hood Lane opposite Winnersh railway station as being out on 15th November 2017, as can be seen from the screenshot provided to the Council.

As this report is now coming up for its 1st anniversary I would like to know what action (if any) has been carried out since I reported this fault.

As a regular user of Winnersh railway station, I have not witnessed this street light functioning since I first reported it, and it is still out at the time of submitting this question.

Answer

The problem with this particular street light is with the cabling which is provided by Scottish and Southern Electricity Power Distribution and it has been reported to them on numerous occasions but unfortunately, as you are obviously aware, it has not yet been resolved and I will take it up again and get the Officers to talk to the relevant company to get them to fix it; but it is not quite in my gift to go down with a screwdriver and sort it out. I will do what I can and obviously with the winter nights coming in getting it resolved is obviously important.

Supplementary Question

It appears that this important street light opposite Winnersh station which caters for approximately 450,000 passengers per annum has been neglected by Wokingham Borough Council. I reported four street lights out 23, 24, 25 and 26 King Street Lane on 4 September this year and these were repaired by Scottish and Southern because they had a cable fault. How can Wokingham Borough Council improve its service to the residents and travelling public in the future and not have a repeat of a neglected lamp column no 5 in Robin Hood Lane?

Supplementary Answer

As I said earlier the issue fundamentally is with the company providing the power and the cabling and they have to resolve it but I will take it up and I will get you a written answer as to when I expect something to be dealt with.

64.2 Rachel Bishop-Firth asked the Executive Member for Highways and Transport the following question:

Question

I asked a question in February about the Memorandum of Understanding which the Council and Network Rail signed in 2016 to develop a solution to the Tanhill Lane crossing. This crossing currently has two separate bridges including a steep and unsightly temporary bridge which is very inconvenient for residents.

Keith Baker told me that the Memorandum of Understanding states that 'Network Rail and Wokingham Borough Council will collaborate on a permanent ramped footbridge solution upon the progression of development proposals for the multi storey car park and the life expiration of the existing stepped footbridge over the Gatwick to Reading line'.

The multi-story car park has been open for some time now, but the unsightly and inconvenient temporary bridge is still in place.

Could the Executive Member for Highways and Transport please provide an update on what action the Council is taking to progress this project, and when residents can expect to see a permanent ramped footbridge in place?

Answer

As previously stated, you are correct in that the Council and Network Rail have entered into a Memorandum of Understanding. The purpose of this is to record the parties' intention to work in a spirit of mutual trust and co-operation, which isn't often forthcoming with the railway companies, associated with the aim of delivering a ramped footbridge over the railway at Tan House railway crossing.

In line with Network Rail's current policies the responsibility for the delivery of a new bridge over the London line is indicated to be acceptable to replace what was effectively, they call it at grade but what it basically means is you walk over the line which is probably more dangerous than the bridge that is there now, the pedestrian crossing as the existing bridge over the Guildford line is not yet due for replacement or upgrade. I suspect the need is for a bridge that spans both lines apart from just one. The Council is of the view that improved facilities of both the London and Guildford lines accommodating pedestrians and cyclists is more beneficial for users.

In respect of costs for the delivery of a new bridge, temporary or permanent, are also covered within the Memorandum of Understanding as follows:

- Network Rail will wholly fund the temporary stepped bridge; and
- both Network Rail and WBC will approach funding collaboratively in respect of a permanent ramped footbridge solution.

This is a Network Rail pedestrian bridge and unfortunately they have made no movement to progress from the current position. As there is no budget available from us at least, it will struggle to be prioritised from our end but I will try and get some information out of Network Rail and see if I can let you have it in due course but I will keep you informed.

Supplementary Question

I think we are all agreed that money is going to be an issue and the need to co-ordinate with Network Rail is going to be an issue. When I raised this question back in February Keith Baker acknowledged that CIL money could possibly be used to finance the funding of a permanent bridge. I am concerned that we do not seem to have any real action taken since 2016 when the Memorandum of Understanding was signed to find solutions and progress the building of a permanent ramped foot bridge and this is leaving local residents with an eyesore temporary bridge which many people cannot use.

Will the Council commit to approaching Network Rail within the next six months to establish a publicly available plan of action and timescales for the building of a permanent bridge which meets the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act for accessibility?

Supplementary Answer

I am happy to approach Network Rail and I will do it almost immediately. However as they have to be party to any decisions I doubt whether I can give you the timescales etc that you request but I will try.

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

Question

I would like to ask a question on Item 65, the Revenue Monitoring Report. I am surprised to see under Corporate Services a cost pressure from increased business rates at Shute End and other corporate properties. What steps has the Council taken or intends to take to reduce this cost pressure?

Answer

I am sure that you will have been aware that nationally business rates were re-assessed in 2017 and this resulted in many properties being revalued and this included the Council's operational estate and as we have quite a large building here it mainly included Shute End. As such the Council was required to pay more business rates on its corporate properties. In 2017/18, Business Services was able to absorb this cost into its budget but following a review of budgets during Phase 1 of 21st Century Council the service no longer holds the capacity in the budgets to pay for the increased business rates. Therefore this is creating a pressure in the 2018/19 financial year and in future years' budgets it will be increased to cover the statutory pressure; so that is the pressure that you are seeing through at the moment.

Supplementary Question

You have referred, I think, to the large building that we are sitting in now and recognising that the potential shape of local government may well change in the coming years I was hoping that you would have perhaps considered looking again at the option of moving out from this site and allowing this site to be used for another priority of this Council which is truly affordable housing. Will you consider that?

Supplementary Answer

We continue to look at all of our assets right across the Council. The Council holds many assets, including things like car parks etc and we have to provide value for money across everything we do for our whole entire community. We will work with all of our partners through things like "One Public Estate"; that means working the police, health partners, the voluntary sector, the town and parish councils to see how we can work to make sure we are all using our assets appropriately so that we all get best value for money. If that means looking at this building then that is what we will also be doing.

65. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

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

65.1 Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey asked the Executive Member for Business, Economic Development and Strategic Planning the following question:

Question

When is the Borough Design guide scheduled to be updated, to reflect changes in the Borough including increasing car ownership and renewable energy requirements for new builds?

Answer

The Borough Design Guide, you are quite right, was adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document to the Core Strategy in 2012.

Through the establishment of design principles, the Guide assists our decisions, enhances the quality of development and ensures that proposals are of the highest quality of design, as I think you probably know.

That means inclusive, safe, harmonious, welcoming and all the good stuff that is in the guide.

As a supplementary document the design principles and sustainability ambitions within it need to be underpinned by our Local Plan policies and an evidence base is required to support these policies.

Since these are currently being reviewed, as you will see later in the agenda, as part of our Local Plan Update, the logical time to review the Guide would be alongside this process. This will mean that any amendments reflect our updated planning strategy and management policies when these are established. The appropriateness of the parking standards could similarly be reviewed on this basis.

Supplementary Question

As Simon can probably remember and as every Executive Member for Highways can remember that I am always trying to get at least two spaces per dwelling because the realistic idea is that Wokingham has the highest first car ownership, the second highest second car ownership and the fifth highest third car ownership in the country. What are we going to do before we have 'carmageddon' in these new developments which is actually going on right now? If you go to any new development you will see cars parked all over the place because of inadequate parking. The standards are not adequate for purpose. So when is it going to change?

Supplementary Answer

I totally agree with you.

65.2 Imogen Shepherd-DuBey asked the Executive Member for Planning and Enforcement the following question:

Question

This week, at our Planning Meeting, I saw housing applications being approved for developments that only provides for just over one car parking space per home. These are often in locations where there is scant provision for public transport and very few services nearby. I have seen housing plans for even less than one space per home in Wokingham, with the excuse of 'it's near the train station'.

Experience shows that we end up with too many cars for the spaces provided. There are several housing developments where residents are desperate for better parking solutions than what has been provided. Most homes have at least two working adults who need to use cars and in other situations there is not enough space for anyone visiting and often these visitor spots are permanently used by residents to alleviate the parking problems. We end up with cars parking on pavements, grassland and neighbouring streets. Essentially, under-providing car parking in Wokingham, is really, really not working.

I'd like to know what Wokingham Borough Council now and in future plans to stop the chaos of parking problems continuing?

Answer

WBC has an adopted parking strategy as you are aware and this was consulted on and approved by Members as formal Council policy. All recommendations to the Planning Committee are based on a full assessment of all the material considerations, including the relevant current parking standards and the Planning Committee need to take those into account when determining planning applications. Schemes presented at the Committee would normally be determined in accordance with the Council's current prevailing parking standards unless there is a very clear reason to vary those. That would need to be set out in the Committee report and entirely proven and justified. We are currently in the process of updating our local plan and through this process we will carefully consider the appropriateness of the current standards as we go forward and whether they need to be reviewed.

Supplementary question

While I see that is very well intended and things and I understand what it is but in practice I feel that it is not happening. I particularly don't see it happening with the properties that we have control of, things like WHL build, particularly around Carnival Pool and the Peach Place Development and things like this. The parking we have put in those places going forward is inadequate and if we do not make sure that we stick to the standards ourselves how on earth do we expect third party developers to do the same?

Supplementary answer

In response to that I would say that where we have varied the standards there is a justification for that. For instance, as you have mentioned, properties built very close to the station will generally not be required to have the same formal parking standards as properties that are not easily within public transport links. But as you probably know Councillor Ferris is your representative on the Local Plan Update Group and as he knows me well I will be happy to work collaboratively with him and with Councillor Munro to ensure that parking standards are something that is looked at as we go to the Local Plan Update.

65.3 Carl Doran had asked the Executive Member for Planning and Enforcement the following question. Due to his inability to attend the meeting a written reply was provided:

Question

The Government is currently consulting on changing the planning rules around exploratory drilling for shale gas, with a view to making it a "permitted development" right. Has Wokingham Borough Council made a submission to this consultation?

Answer

As a unitary authority Wokingham Borough is also a Minerals and Waste Planning Authority. This means the Council would be responsible for determining any oil and gas proposals within its administrative area.

The current Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government's (MHCLG) consultation relates to proposed changes to permitted development rights for non-hydraulic shale gas. The consultation seeks views on the principle of granting planning permission for non-hydraulic shale gas exploration development through a permitted development right. It is important to note that the proposed changes only relate to shale gas, and proposals which do not include hydraulic fracturing, also known as fracking.

Nationally, unconventional oil and gas sources, such as shale, are emerging as a potential form of energy supply. However information on existing sites as well as places with the greatest potential for oil and gas does not indicate extraction is likely in Wokingham Borough. This is because there is no history of extraction in the Borough and geologically it doesn't overlay any known viable shale reserves. Although the Government has offered licences for oil and gas exploration in the Borough, none have been taken up. As a result there is no demand for oil and gas exploration in the Borough and Officers are not aware of any plans for oil or gas either through conventional or unconventional methods of extraction.

Accordingly a response has not been submitted to this consultation as there is no evidence of demand for oil and gas exploration anywhere in the Borough. The Council will of course continue to monitor future government proposals and consultations regarding any proposed changes to planning for oil and gas.

65.4 Ian Pittock asked the Executive Member for Highways and Transport the following question:

Question

Shouldn't all new roads include both a cycleway and a footway alongside at the time the route is built rather than trying to retrofit these at a later date?

Answer

I think that putting cycleways on some of our current roads, which weren't built recently, is a sensible thing to do. I understand the sense of your question going forward and looking at new roads however it will need to be considered at the planning stage as there is no point trying to do it after the stage when you are planning the new roads and obviously we have to ensure that we have the relevant CIL monies or developer contributions available. Also, I think this has been linked in, that the decision has to be linked to the planning policies that we have available. So I think it is maybe another thing for the local plan update to consider. That I think is how I see us going forward.

Supplementary Question

The new Shinfield Relief Road, from what many call the Blackboys' Roundabout, is accompanied by both a footway and a cycleway down to the small roundabout at the Science Park. Why are the footway and cycleway not continued down to the junction with the Arborfield Road at the Magpie and Parrot despite the fact that there is bags of room both sides of the road especially given the expected several thousand housing site just along the road at Hall Farm?

Supplementary Answer

Firstly Hall Farm was not on anyone's radar when the Eastern Relief Road was designed. Secondly, the reason for the cycle and footway down to the first mini-roundabout is because of the Science Park which was part and parcel of the application of the first phase of that relief road and it had to go in the bridge over the motorway at the relief road down to that first roundabout. That was actually necessary to give access to the Science Park. Given that the Science Park is a University of Reading facility, and obviously people are going to and from the main University campus, and therefore perhaps a lot of people would like to use their bicycles or walk that distance perhaps. So that is why it was incorporated into that.

As far as the rest of the Eastern Relief Road is concerned when it was conceived it was very much a relief road and not an ordinary estate road and as I said earlier the fact that Hall Farm at that stage, three or four years ago, was not on anyone's radar as coming through as a major development. I am afraid if Hall Farm happens and we consider it necessary to put in a footway and a cycleway then I am afraid we are going to have to retrofit it.

65.5 Clive Jones asked the Executive Member for Environment the following question:

Question

re3 have been charging for DIY household waste since September 2016. This is against the advice of two Conservative cabinet ministers and some junior ministers.

Can you advise me when re3 will be taking the advice of your very senior colleagues and ceasing making these charges which as you know may well be unlawful.

Answer

Firstly just to state that re3 does not charge for household waste so your question is incorrect. re3, as you are aware, is the waste management partnership between Bracknell, Reading and Wokingham Councils and manages the recycling centres in Bracknell and in Reading. Like all local authorities re3 has a statutory duty to provide waste management services for household waste, but in common with other councils, the re3 partner councils have introduced charges for the disposal of 'non-household' wastes such as soil, rubble, and so on.

If on the other hand you are proposing to stop charging for this waste then please tell me how much you would increase the council tax by to compensate the loss of this income?

Supplementary Question

There are several councils that disagree with re3 policy and do not charge for what is described as DIY household waste; and that is a description that comes from your own Government. So I am very disappointed that you are not changing your policy. Let us see what the current Secretary of State says because I have not had a reply from him yet. If he says that you should not be charging for DIY waste will you urge re3 to change their policy?

Supplementary Answer

If the Government changes legislation so that we cannot charge then clearly we will follow that legislation.

Just to be clear re3 charges for the following sorts of things just to read from their policy. Things like: bricks, breezeblocks, concrete, cement, drainage pipes, gravel, hardcore, paving slabs, rubble, sand, sanitary ware, slates, stone, tarmac and tiles. So it is all those sorts of things that re3 charges for.

In the Controlled Waste Regulations 2012 it states that waste from construction or demolition works, including preparatory work, is defined as industrial waste.

While in opposition Liberals will say just about anything to gain a few votes but once in power they change their tune. You asked about other councils Cornwall Council, which is controlled by a Liberal and independent alliance also charges for waste. As does the

Liberal controlled Portsmouth City Council. Taking plasterboard as an example Cornwall charges £4 a bag, Portsmouth £6 a bag and re3 £3 a bag.

In Portsmouth a decision was made on 22 September 2016 to commence charging. The Liberals complained about this and said it should be reversed. The Liberals then took control of Portsmouth City Council earlier this year. Surprise, surprise on 13 July 2018 the Liberal Democrat Cabinet Member for Environment and Community Safety considered a paper on the future of charging for the waste and took the decision to continue with the charges. So just look at your own colleagues before you start whingeing about other people.

65.6 Prue Bray asked the Executive Member for Children's Services the following question:

Question

The Revenue Monitoring Report (Agenda Item 65) shows a predicted overspend for this year for Children's Services that is £790k higher than the overspend that was predicted in July, all of it in Social Work and Early Intervention Services, which in July was predicted to have no overspend. The notes suggest that this is due to increased staffing costs. What has happened to cause these sudden and clearly unanticipated additional costs?

Answer

I must emphasise that this is not the fault of any of our Officers or anyone in particular. The predictions in July assumed that any increase in staffing costs would be met by savings elsewhere in the Children's Social Care budget. This has proved not to be the case because increases in activity and number of children requiring assessment, looked after children, and those subject to child protection plans has grown considerably. In addition the recruitment of staff to meet these demands and have manageable caseloads has had to rely on the use of agency workers who are considerably more expensive than permanent employees.

In the medium term we are planning to deliver more effective alternatives to care strategies and develop a further recruitment and retention initiative that will make Wokingham an even more attractive place for social workers and others to work in and we have set up a working party to look at this. There will be an interim report on its work at the November Children's Services Scrutiny Committee.

Supplementary Question

Somewhat similarly to the question Keith Malvern asked this sounds like a little bit of slightly overoptimistic budgeting in the first place. I think perhaps realistically how much of the total overspend, which is £996k, do you think you will be able to claw back by the end of the financial year?

Supplementary Answer

I cannot be absolutely certain about that but I can assure you that we are exploring a number of measures both short term and longer term. The longer term strategies obviously will not deliver any successful results this year but over the next 2-3 years they will do. One example of that is building more homes within the Borough for future special needs children. Not those who are currently outside because they are in stable places and cannot really be moved. There will be more information on our various strategies in due course. This is something that we are concerned about and are genuinely working on.

65.7 Lindsay Ferris asked the Executive Member for Finance the following question:

Question

At the 20th September Full Council Meeting I asked the following supplementary question under Agenda Item 50.4

My question related to a number of contracts including the joint WBC/WTC contract covering the recent Market Place Refurbishment.

“Can you confirm how much of the contingency above the £3.8m originally allocated has already been used by each Council?”

As of Friday 19th October, I have yet to receive the courtesy of a reply.

However on Page 55 under Agenda item 66 Capital Monitoring. I was perplexed and somewhat annoyed to find the answer to my question has been included within the Recommendation Section - which states - £200k increased contingency match-funding contribution from Wokingham Town Council for the Wokingham Town Centre improvements is now included in the capital budget. This then clearly indicates that both WTC and WBC are to pay an extra £200k each to cover the additional requirement over and above the original £3.8M taking the cost of the Market Place refurbishment to £4.2m.

Are there likely to be any additional costs over and above this £4.2m figure and if so when and how are we to be advised of this figure?

Answer

The original construction budget for the scheme was £3.8m with a contingency amount to be agreed of £400,000. The construction costs are split between Wokingham Borough Council and Wokingham Town Council on an equal basis. The additional £200,000 in the capital budget is Wokingham Town Council's share of the contingency that has now been drawn down to match the Wokingham Borough Council contingency.

To date there has been a £4.1m spent already.

There is an amount of £360,000 in dispute and it is hoped that the final settlement amount will be contained within the budget, including the contingency, but this is very much depending on the final resolution and there may be some cost pressures on the budget going forward.

So at this time I do not have the final figure but I expect to have that early December.

Supplementary Question

Would any additional costs over and above the £4.2m be provided on a matched funding basis?

Supplementary Answer

I cannot give you that answer at this time because we are still in negotiations with Balfour Beatty and WSP and as I said we are in discussions about £360,000 so I will know that early December time and then be able to give you an answer about that.

65.8 David Hare asked the Executive Member for Adult Social Care, Health and Wellbeing the following question:

Question

The Government has announced extra funding of £240m for Adult Social Care budgets to be used over the winter. WBC's share of this is £401,589. Will this extra money be used to ease the pressure on the health system by paying for home care packages to help patients get out of hospital quicker, reablement packages to help patients carry out everyday tasks and regain mobility and confidence, and home adaptations? Or, will it be used to reduce the projected deficit for adult social services from about £800,000 (page 40 of the Executive agenda) to £400,000?

Answer

We welcome the additional allocation of funding from Central Government for Adult Social Care. We will review how this can support our front line staff, equipment and commissioning of packages of care.

In addition, we will continue to monitor the current strong performance of our Better Care Fund Service which supports the responsive discharges including the envisaged demands over the coming winter period.

Supplementary Question

The extra funding is probably too late to recruit many short term staff to help with the winter pressures because it has only just come. John Redwood, from what he wrote about this, implied that you will be improving the services that the Council are giving but would not most of this money mainly be going to be used to reduce the deficit rather than provide extra services?

Supplementary Answer

Yes you are right the letter was dated 17 October and we were waiting to see what strings were attached to it. Basically the letter from the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care has told us that the money has got to be spent on DToC (Delayed Transfer of Care) and we are actually working up a scheme to be able to deliver on that but as you know DToC requires us working with our health partners and the voluntary sector therefore it would be prudent for us to actually spend that £401,000 wisely. So we are actually working up a plan and it is actually a plan that I welcome the Liberals actually being involved in as well.

66. 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 setting out the budget monitoring position and providing an operational update on the work of the Council Owned Companies for the period to 31 August 2018.

When introducing the report Councillor Munro reminded the meeting that the report covered both the housing companies and the adult care services company Optalis.

In relation to the work of WHL Councillor Pauline Jorgensen updated the meeting on matters which had arisen since the report was written which included the fact that work

had now started on the Tape Lane site and that in January 2019 Broadway House would be providing an extra 10 units of temporary accommodation.

With regard to Optalis Councillor Pollock informed Members that the company continued to receive “good” ratings when their services were inspected by the Care Quality Commission (CQC); which was an improvement on previous inspection ratings. In addition staff turnover continued to be low, particularly compared to the national average, and had reduced by over half since the new Chief Executive had taken over. The Chief Executive had also been responsible for promoting the company to other councils and improving its public perception which had been achieved in part by the publication of a number of articles in the national press.

The Leader of Council commended Optalis on their good CQC results and informed Members that she had been very impressed, during a recent visit to one of their care homes, with the care and activities they were providing and the pride that the staff had in working for Optalis; which had led to lower rates of sickness and higher rates of retention.

RESOLVED that:

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

67. REVENUE MONITORING REPORT 2018/19 – END OF SEPTEMBER 2018

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

In relation to the Adult Services’ budget the Executive Member for Adult Social Care advised that although the adverse variance was showing as £800k significant progress was being made to reduce that further. Exactly how much the variance would be reduced was as yet unknown as it was difficult to predict what future pressures/demands might come forward. Officers were however working very hard to reduce the figure without making any cuts in services. Councillor Dolinski confirmed that one area that was being looked at was the provision of services that would enable people to remain in their own home rather than going into a care home.

The Executive Member for Children’s Services reported that the service was facing a massive challenge relating to increased demand as there were more children requiring support. Councillor Helliar-Symons highlighted some of the pressures facing the service which included: an increase of a third since this time last year in the number of looked after children in the Borough which resulted in the need for more foster carers; there were more children whose needs were being catered for outside of the Borough which resulted in more home to school transport costs; more children with complex needs who were living longer; Government legislation meant that young people in the Council’s care now had to be looked after until they were 25; and in addition there were increased costs of residential care.

With regard to the ongoing pressure in the High Needs Block Councillor Helliar-Symons informed Members that the number of pupils with special educational needs had risen by almost 15% in the last 2-3 years. The proportion of those with social, emotional and mental health or autistic spectrum disorder was increasing in the Borough beyond the

numbers seen nationally and indeed across the whole of the South East. In addition there were insufficient suitable placements within the Borough which resulted in an increased reliance on expensive, independent, out of Borough provision.

In order to address some of these pressures the Council was looking to build more placements within the Borough but this would not benefit those whose needs were currently catered for outside the Borough as they were settled and could not be moved. It would therefore be 2-3 years before any return on investment would be seen.

The Leader of Council stated that matters had moved on quite substantially since the report was published and the current position was actually more favourable than was set out in the report.

RESOLVED that:

- 1) the quarter two 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) it be noted that there are no Carry Forward estimates to the General Fund identified at this stage;
- 3) the updates on the Adult Social Care Action Plan and the Children's Services' Action Plan (previously High Needs Block Action Plan) be noted.

68. CAPITAL MONITORING 2018/19 - END OF SEPTEMBER 2018

The Executive considered a report setting out the current position of the Capital Budget.

The Leader of Council advised the meeting that there was a small variance in the Capital Budget however when taking into account the fact that this financial year the Capital Budget was £134m the variance as a proportion was not very large.

The Executive Member for Highways and Transport drew Members' attention to the estimated under and overspends, as set out in the report, which showed that when taking the entire Capital Programme into account, which amounted to £222m, no overspend was actually anticipated and variances in the current year spend were likely to relate to re-profiling of schemes whose spend was planned for next financial year.

RESOLVED that:

- 1) the quarter two position for the capital budget, as set out in Appendix A to the report, be noted;
- 2) the overall value of the 2018/19 capital programme budget include the final part of the previously agreed ring-fenced capital contribution, for £200k increased contingency match-funding contribution from Wokingham Town Council for the Wokingham Town Centre Improvements capital budget;
- 3) the overall value of the 2018/19 capital programme budget include £164k S106 contributions for sports facilities to increase the capital budget for the Bulmershe Sports Centre.

69. LOCAL PLAN UPDATE (LPU) TOWARDS OUR STRATEGY CONSULTATION

The Executive considered a report relating to the Local Plan Update (LPU) which was intended to provide a robust strategy for managing development to ensure that it occurred in suitable and sustainable locations and that it was deliverable and well-designed and would help to regenerate towns and villages within the Borough, whilst supporting social and economic prosperity and encouraging economic growth.

When introducing the report the Executive Member for Business, Economic Development and Strategic Planning stated that the purpose of the report was to seek approval to undertake consultation to assist the development of the Local Plan Update. The consultation would last from November 2018-February 2019 and every household in the Borough would be provided with a pack explaining the process that was being followed and this would be supplemented by public meetings which would be held at around 10 different venues within the Borough.

As part of the process Councillor Munro advised that the Council would be considering over 300 sites and this figure was expected to grow during the consultation period. The purpose of the consultation was to gain residents' views on the sites that had been put forward and how development should be managed in different places across the Borough.

Following a query by Councillor Pollock it was confirmed that a number of council owned sites had been included on the list. In addition, given that residents were unhappy with the amount of development and associated traffic congestion, Members queried why the Council was carrying out this process now, particularly as there was already in existence a Local Plan which ran until 2026. Councillor Munro explained that the Council was required to constantly review its Local Plan to ensure that it was still valid and in addition if the process wasn't followed then there was the danger that unsuitable planning applications could be won on appeal. In addition this was an opportunity to get residents' views on development within the Borough.

Councillor Weeks informed the meeting that he, and others, had recently met with the Chief Planner from the Ministry of Housing and Local Government and whilst the Chief Planner was very positive that the Council had a structured Local Plan, which was enabling the delivery of houses in the right places, he had made it clear that it was absolutely essential to have an up to date, and frequently updated, Local Plan in order to continue to be able to direct where the housing numbers needed to go that were being imposed on the Council by central Government.

The Leader of Council urged everyone to take part in the consultation, and particularly attend the public events, as it would be an opportunity for residents to have their say about where they would like new homes of the future and new facilities to be built.

RESOLVED that:

- 1) the 'Local Plan Update: Towards our Strategy' be approved for consultation, including supporting engagement activities;
- 2) the Director of Corporate Services and Director Locality and Customer Services be authorised, in consultation with the Executive Member for Business, Economic Development and Strategic Planning, to agree minor amendments, if necessary, prior to consultation;

3) the Local Development Scheme 2018 be adopted.

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
PERSONNEL BOARD
HELD ON 31 OCTOBER 2018 FROM 6.30 PM TO 6.35 PM**

Committee Members Present

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

Officers Present

Madeleine Shopland, Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist
Sarah Swindley, Lead Specialist HR
Heather Thwaites, Acting Chief Executive

58. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence.

59. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Board held on 5 September 2018 and the Minutes of the Extraordinary meetings held on 6 September and 4 October 2018 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

60. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest received.

61. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no public questions.

62. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

There were no Member questions.

63. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

RESOLVED: That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 1 and 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act (as amended) as appropriate.

64. EXERCISING OF PENSION DISCRETIONS

The Board received a report regarding the exercising of pension discretions.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations contained within Part 2 of the report be agreed.

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
PERSONNEL BOARD
HELD ON 31 OCTOBER 2018 FROM 6.45 PM TO 8.25 PM**

Committee Members Present

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

Officers Present

Madeleine Shopland, Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist
Sarah Swindley, Lead Specialist HR
Heather Thwaites, Acting Chief Executive
Julie Towers, Penna

65. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence.

66. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Councillors Haitham Taylor and Ferris declared Personal Interests in Agenda Item 56 Short List for Permanent Chief Executive and Director Locality and Customer Services due to the fact that they felt that they could not comment on one of the candidate's suitability. They remained in the meeting and did not participate in discussions or vote with regards to that particular candidate.

67. APPOINTMENT OF INTERIM CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Members received a report regarding the appointment of an Interim Chief Executive.

Following the resignation of the interim Chief Executive it was proposed that Heather Thwaites be appointed to cover the role on a short term basis until such time as Personnel Board was able to interview and appoint a permanent Chief Executive.

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to Council that Heather Thwaites be appointed Interim Chief Executive until Personnel Board are able to interview and appoint a permanent Chief Executive, subject to no objections from the majority of the Executive.

68. SHORT LIST FOR PERMANENT CHIEF EXECUTIVE AND DIRECTOR LOCALITY AND CUSTOMER SERVICES

The Board considered a report regarding shortlisting for the posts of permanent Chief Executive and Director Locality and Customer Services.

69. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

RESOLVED: That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 1 and 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act (as amended) as appropriate.

70. SHORT LIST FOR PERMANENT CHIEF EXECUTIVE AND DIRECTOR LOCALITY AND CUSTOMER SERVICES

The Board received a report regarding shortlisting for the posts of permanent Chief Executive and Director Locality and Customer Services.

RESOLVED: That

1) the reports submitted by the Executive search firm Penna with regards to the long listed applicants for the permanent role of Chief Executive who attended Technical Interviews on 16 and 17 October be reviewed and that six candidates be taken forward for interview;

2) the reports submitted by the Executive search firm Penna with regards to the long listed applicants for the permanent role of Director Locality and Customer Services who attended Technical Interviews on 17 and 18 October be reviewed and that five candidates be taken forward for interview.

71. DIRECTOR, CHILDREN'S SERVICES T&C'S

The Board received a report regarding the Director Children's Services Terms and Conditions.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations set out in Part 2 be agreed.

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

**INDIVIDUAL EXECUTIVE MEMBER
 DECISION RECORD SHEET
 IMD 2018/41**

Title of the report	Statement of Community Involvement
----------------------------	---

DECISION MADE BY Executive Member for Business, Economic Development and Strategic Planning - Stuart Munro
 Executive Member for Planning and Enforcement - Simon Weeks

ACTION BY Director of Corporate Services - Graham Ebers, Director of Locality and Customer Services - Interim Sarah Hollamby

DECISION MADE ON 01 November 2018

Recommendation contained in the report

That the Executive Member for Business, Economic Development and Strategic Planning and Executive Member for Planning and Enforcement agree that Wokingham Borough Council:

- 1) Consults on the draft Statement of Community Involvement as contained in Appendix A.

Decision

That the Executive Member for Business, Economic Development and Strategic Planning and Executive Member for Planning and Enforcement agree that Wokingham Borough Council:

- 1) Consults on the draft Statement of Community Involvement 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 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

Draft Statement of Community Involvement

PUBLISHED ON: 1 November 2018

EFFECTIVE ON: 9 November 2018

CALL-IN PERIOD EXPIRES: 8 November 2018

Decision made in the presence of:
 Neil Carr, Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist
 Sarah Hollamby, Assistant Director, Place Commissioning

**INDIVIDUAL EXECUTIVE MEMBER
 DECISION RECORD SHEET
 IMD 2018/36**

Title of the report	Response to Government Consultation on Social Housing Green Paper
----------------------------	--

DECISION MADE BY Executive Member for Housing - Pauline Jorgensen
ACTION BY Director of Locality and Customer Services - Interim Sarah Hollamby
DECISION MADE ON 05 November 2018

Recommendation contained in the report

That the Executive Member for Housing approves the consultation response for submission.

Decision

That the Executive Member for Housing approves the consultation response for submission.

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 comment.
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

None

PUBLISHED ON: 06 November 2018

EFFECTIVE ON: 14 November 2018

CALL-IN PERIOD EXPIRES: 13 November 2018

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE COMMUNITY AND CORPORATE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE HELD ON 5 NOVEMBER 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 and David Sleight

Other Councillors Present

Councillors: Malcolm Richards

Officers Present

Callum Wernham (Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist), Neil Carr (Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist), Mark Cupit (Assistant Director, Delivery and Infrastructure), Geoff Hislop (Car Park Manager) and Clare Lawrence (Assistant Director - Place)

28. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted from Bill Soane and Shahid Younis.

29. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 10 September 2018 and the Extraordinary meeting of the Committee held on 1 October 2018 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

30. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

31. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no public questions.

32. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

There were no Member questions.

33. CIVIL PARKING ENFORCEMENT

The Committee considered a report, set out in agenda pages 17 to 28, which provided an update on the Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) strategy after its first year of enactment.

Clare Lawrence, Assistant Director – Place, stated that the business case for the CPE was based on a cost neutral arrangement and that the operation had met this assumption after its first year. She added that there had been a number of problems in recruiting Civil Enforcement Officers and that there was currently one vacant post which was actively being recruited for. Clare added that once the posts were fully recruited that hopefully this would allow for the cost neutral operation to continue. Clare stated that the patrols of the Civil Enforcement Officers were updated monthly on the Councils websites should Members or members of the public wish to view where the patrols had been.

Malcolm Richards asked as to the number of Civil Enforcement Officer posts. Geoff Hislop, Car Park Manager, stated that there were 8 posts in total, with 7 currently filled and one post being actively recruited for. He added that there were 6 posts at the 6 month stage of the operation and it was decided to increase this number to 8 posts to have a greater capacity.

Rachel Burgess asked whether the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) had been achieved by the contractor (NSL). Geoff Hislop stated that there had been 5 instances where the KPIs had been missed, and in each case this had been related to correspondence letters being issued. He added that this had resulted in a reduction of payments to NSL. Geoff stated that after liaison with NSL by himself and his team there had been recent improvements in this area.

In response to a Member question about incentives for NSL with regards to the quantity of issued tickets, Geoff Hislop replied that there were no incentives for NSL to issue more tickets than were required.

Rachel Burgess referred to page 27 of the agenda, and asked the Officers opinions on Borough residents not being able to have visitors parking for over 30 minutes under the new electronic permit system. Clare Lawrence stated that the permit system had become electronic under CPE and had replaced a paper permit system. She added that there was still a visitor and carer provision under the new electronic system. Clare stated that there had been a consultation for Rose Street residents in which there was a 51/49 percent split from residents in favour of the electronic system. Clare added that she had liaised with the Executive Member for Highways and Transport regarding the issue and that Members were invited to give their views on the permit system. Clare stated that reverting to paper permits would be a step backwards, and that this system was at a greater cost to the Council and was open to abuse (for example, permits being sold online).

In response to a Member question regarding the Parking Strategy item due to go through Executive, Clare Lawrence stated that the item had been taken off of a previous Executive forward programme due to a capacity issue with the volume of work that Highways were undertaking and that she hoped that the item would go through Executive in the New Year.

In response to Member questions regarding the volume of penalties issued at Dinton Pastures, Geoff Hislop stated that Dinton Pastures was in between Wokingham and the outer Borough and was en route between various other locations that the patrols went through, and as a result the Civil Enforcement Officers would check the car park on their journeys.

Clive Jones asked what the criteria was for deciding where the Civil Enforcement Officers would patrol. Geoff Hislop stated that the Officers worked shift patterns, and that there was always a patrol (between 7am and 10pm) occurring within Wokingham. He added that another Officer would be on patrol on foot within the Borough and another on Patrol in a vehicle.

Clive Jones asked whether Officers were aware of a petition from Earley residents for a permanent Civil Enforcement Officers patrolling in the area. Clare Lawrence stated that they were aware of the petition and that they had been working with local schools and the My Journey team to identify and resolve issues. She added that if Earley Town Council (or any other Town or Parish Council within the Borough) wanted more support with CPE that they were encouraged to contact the team and see whether more support could be available should they want to buy in to it. Clare stated that Earley had not been identified as an area which needed more support than other similar areas within the Borough.

Mike Haines asked as to the vast difference in penalties issued at Dinton Pastures compared to California Country Park. Geoff Hislop clarified that the car park at California

Country Park had been undergoing refurbishment and as a result many of the enforcement regulations had been suspended during this time.

Malcolm Richards asked as to the timeframe between ordering a new car parking ticket machine and it then being deployed. Geoff Hislop stated that it was a 12 week period between ordering the machine and it being received, and that the machine would then be installed alongside any others that had been ordered (in order to replace existing damaged and malfunctioning machines) on a rolling deployment plan.

Guy Grandison asked how many complaints regarding the process of enforcement were received regularly. Geoff Hislop stated that approximately 4 to 6 complaints were received per month, and that these usually focussed on the restrictions that were in place (or conversely, where people believed more restrictions should be put in place).

Clive Jones asked at which times of the day that the most penalties had been generally issued. Geoff Hislop stated that he would gather the data and circulate it to the Committee.

In response to a Member question regarding the number of cars compared to lorries that had received penalties, Geoff Hislop stated that he could gather a definitive list of issued penalties and would circulate it to the Committee.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) Clare Lawrence and Geoff Hislop be thanked for attending the meeting;
- 2) the update on Civil Parking Enforcement be noted;
- 3) information and data requested by the Committee be sent to Democratic Services and circulated to Committee Members.

34. MARKET PLACE REGENERATION INTERIM UPDATE

The Committee considered a report, set out in agenda pages 29 to 32, which gave an interim update on the Market Place Regeneration Project. The update detailed the timetable for the upcoming lessons learned report and the road safety audit.

Mark Cupit, Assistant Director, Delivery and Infrastructure, stated that there had been a delay in completing the lessons learned report and the road safety audit due to difficulty in procuring a contractor to undertake the work. He added that a suitable contractor had now been found and that the work had been commissioned, which should result in the reports being available for the January Committee. Mark added that the road safety audit could not be completed until the Peach Place parking restrictions were removed.

Rachel Burgess asked whether any additional safety measures had been considered for the pedestrian road crossing in the town centre. Mark Cupit stated that the safety issues were taken very seriously and that the square of Market Place had been designed with all users in mind. He added that there had been a substantial change in the behaviour of traffic in the square who were taking more time and were allowing people to cross even in areas without a designated crossing. Mark stated that there was also a duty on parents and all users of the square to take care and to familiarise themselves with the new layout.

In response to a Member question regarding safety concerns with shared spaces, Mark Cupit clarified that the Market Place square was not a shared space and that there were defined roadways and pavements.

In response to a Member question regarding any plans for a 20 miles per hour speed limit being introduced in the square, Mark Cupit stated that he felt there was no need to do so currently as many cars had been slowing down and driving responsibly during the 'settling in' period.

Clive Jones asked whether disability groups were consulted during the design stage of the project and if so what they were shown. Mark Cupit stated that several disability groups were invited into the consultation stage and that Guide Dogs for the Blind were amongst one of the groups that had attended sessions. He added that their views and opinions would have been used to shape the design of the public space. Mark stated that he did not have the information on hand as to exactly what these groups were shown, but that records of the meetings would have been kept. Mark informed Members that a workshop with the same disability groups was scheduled to take place on 16 November 2018 to discuss their impressions of the newly opened Market Place.

Clive Jones asked whether it was appropriate for the Executive Member for Regeneration to meet with the contractors with responsibility for completing the road safety audit and the lessons learned report. Mark Cupit stated that himself and Andrew Moulton (Assistant Director – Governance) had taken the lead on procurement of the contractor, and that they felt it appropriate to involve the Lead Member at a later stage in the procurement process.

In response to Member questions regarding delays to the completion of the Market Place Regeneration Project, Mark Cupit stated that work was asked to be halted during the festive period of 2017 and that this was not a planned break. He added that the biggest delays were due to unforeseen underground issues such as old tree roots, old foundations and cellars.

Rachel Burgess asked how many complaints had been received recently with regards to the Market Place. Mark Cupit stated that there had been no recent complaints and that the complaints that were received after the Market Place was re-opened were primarily focussed on safety concerns.

Guy Grandison stated that there was a need to focus the upcoming Town Centre Regeneration item at January's Committee on the Market Place and Peach Place Regeneration Projects, using the lessons learned report and the road safety audit to aid in formulating key lines of inquiry.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) Mark Cupit be thanked for attending the meeting;
- 2) the lessons learned report and the road safety audit be circulated to the Committee as soon as they are completed;
- 3) the Town Centre Regeneration item at January's Committee be focussed on the Market Place and Peach Place Regeneration Projects, using the lessons learned report and the road safety audit to aid in formulating key lines of inquiry;

- 4) Democratic Services contact various stakeholders and interested parties to engage at the January Committee meeting.

35. WORK PROGRAMME 2018/19

The Committee considered a report, set out in agenda pages 33 to 38, which gave details of its proposed work programme for 2018/19.

Members discussed undertaking an in depth review of the 2020/21 budget during the 2019/20 Committee programme. Clive Jones felt that WBC had been doing insufficient budget scrutiny in previous years and applauded the Chairman for wanting to change this for the 2019/20 municipal year with an in depth review of the budget process.

David Sleight stated that the Coppid Beech Park and Ride item should focus on whether there was a need for it to be developed and stated that there was no business case for it.

Guy Grandison requested that a draft of the Parking Strategy Policy be circulated to Members of the Committee.

Members discussed how best to fit the remaining items from the work programme in to the 2 scheduled meetings of the 2018/19 municipal year. Members felt that an Extraordinary meeting in February was required to allow for the remaining items to be reviewed in detail.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) the Committee aim to undertake a review of the budget setting process in the 2019/20 municipal year and that Democratic Services organise budget scrutiny training for Members;
- 2) an Extraordinary meeting be organised for February 2019 to include an item reviewing the proposed Coppid Beech park and ride and an item investigating the impact of changes to train services;
- 3) a draft of the Parking Strategy Policy be requested and circulated to Members of the Committee.

This page is intentionally left blank