



**WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**MINUTES OF COMMITTEE MEETINGS
FOR THE PERIOD**

6 February 2019 to 6 March 2019

Heather Thwaites

Heather Thwaites
Interim Chief Executive
Published on 13 March 2019



WOKINGHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL

Our Vision

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

Our Priorities

Improve educational attainment and focus on every child achieving their potential

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

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

Tackle traffic congestion in specific areas of the Borough

Improve the customer experience when accessing Council services

The Underpinning Principles

Offer excellent value for your Council Tax

Provide affordable homes

Look after the vulnerable

Improve health, wellbeing and quality of life

Maintain and improve the waste collection, recycling and fuel efficiency

Deliver quality in all that we do

	PAGE NO.
Minutes of meeting Wednesday, 6 February 2019 of Audit Committee	5 - 10
Minutes of meeting Monday, 11 February 2019 of Community and Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee	11 - 18
Minutes of meeting Wednesday, 13 February 2019 of Planning Committee	19 - 26
Minutes of meeting Thursday, 14 February 2019 of Wokingham Borough Wellbeing Board	27 - 32
Decisions , 18/02/2019 Executive - Individual Member Decisions	33 - 34
Decisions , 18/02/2019 Executive - Individual Member Decisions	35 - 36
Decisions , 18/02/2019 Executive - Individual Member Decisions	37 - 38
Minutes of meeting Wednesday, 20 February 2019 of Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee	39 - 46
Minutes of meeting Thursday, 21 February 2019 of Executive	47 - 54
Minutes of meeting Monday, 4 March 2019 of Standards Committee	55 - 58
Decisions , 05/03/2019 Executive - Individual Member Decisions	59 - 60
Minutes of meeting Wednesday, 6 March 2019 of Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee	61 - 66

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
AUDIT COMMITTEE
HELD ON 6 FEBRUARY 2019 FROM 6.30 PM TO 7.55 PM**

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Chris Smith (Chairman), Daniel Sargeant, Imogen Shepherd-DuBey and Graham Howe

Also Present

Madeleine Shopland, Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist
Helen Thompson, Ernst and Young
Carol Cammiss, Director Children's Services
Andrew Moulton, Assistant Director Governance
Bob Watson, Lead Specialist Finance

46. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted from Councillors David Chopping and Oliver Whittle.

47. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

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

48. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Councillor Daniel Sargeant declared a Personal Interest in Item 53 Corporate Risk Register on the grounds that his mother was an administrator working in Children's Services.

49. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

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

49.1 Chris Wallace asked the Chairman of Audit Committee the following question.

Could the Chairman please tell me what the process is for auditing data protection breaches particularly those reported by a 3rd party, there is nothing documented on the GDPR page of your website which only covers reporting of your own data breach?

Answer

Thank you for your question.

Wokingham takes very seriously all potential data protection breaches whether reported by the public, internally by staff or third party organisations.

The process for internal and third party reported breaches is exactly the same.

Every potential breach is investigated, and where appropriate, improvement actions are implemented. These could include, for example, additional staff training, and/or changes to processes and procedures.

Where the breach meets the threshold set out by the Information Commissioner, a report is made to the Information Commissioner who will consider what further action, if any, is required.

I have confirmed with Officers that there are no breaches by third parties that require or have been reported to the ICO. However, we are aware of an incident just before Christmas where two letters were placed in the same envelope and were opened by a resident, I believe in Winnersh. This is being investigated and we are seeing what changes to processes need to be implemented to make sure this does not happen again.

I will also ask the team to look at the Council's website to make it clearer how to report any breaches so that there is a much clearer line of reporting and for ease for members of the public.

Supplementary Question:

It seems to go into a black hole if you report something. You do not get any feedback that it has been received by Data Protection people. The latest breach, I have had personal details of at least five in the last year and I do not know whether anything has happened to them. The latest one also included a member of the public ringing Customer Services and being told 'oh it is a mistake, they happen, bin them.' What they were told to bin was 12 pages of someone else's benefits covering 3 years. Those are the originals if a member of staff would like them back.

Supplementary Answer:

What I will say here is that I have been informed of this. I understand that it is due to the manual nature of the envelope stuffing and therefore because it is a manual process, it is more open to mistakes occurring. As I have said, when we identify these risks we look at the processes and we look at if changes can be made. I am expecting a report to come through to tell me what will change, what will happen, whether we can automate the envelope stuffing process to ensure that this does not happen again. As you say you have been aware of five breaches, if you could provide me with the details of the other four, we will go and make sure and try and work out what the root causes were. We will try and work out the root cause and try and change the process to make sure it does not happen but that sort of data should not be going public. It is personal, confidential information and therefore we do want to get to the bottom of this and stop this happening.

Chris Wallace also asked how many other instances there had been where mistakes had been made and people had been told to bin the documents, and if the incidents were being reported.

The Assistant Director Governance responded with the following:

We do have what I would consider to be a reasonable process in terms of receiving, logging and following up on complaints. I must say that it is important for me to look at these specific ones that you have brought here tonight, but through the Chair we will make sure that you get feedback. I would be happy to meet you on a one to one basis.

The Chairman also responded:

All of these seem to be manual emails or a manual intervention. My own firm, when I send an attachment that is not to an internal email, flashes up with a box saying 'are you sure you want to send this attachment to this person?' I do not know if that happens in Wokingham emails but those are the sort of interventions that can be implemented relatively easily. We will look at these and from what I can tell, the first 4 were before GDPR became mandatory and the last one is after, but we take them all very, very seriously and need to understand why these are happening.

50. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

There were no Member questions.

51. UPDATE ON INTERNAL AUDIT OF HOUSING RENTS

The Committee received an update on the internal audit of Housing Rents.

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

- The internal audit of Housing Rents had concluded with a level 3 assurance which meant that there were weaknesses identified in the systems of internal control.
- Members were updated on the current and former rent arrears and progress made against the target to reduce arrears as a percentage of annual debt to 2% by the end of 2019/20.
- Members were informed that the former tenant arrears amount had increased from £181,208.63 (as at March 2018) to £234,238.44 (as at November 2018). As debt aged it often became harder to collect. Nevertheless, a positive direction of travel was being seen.
- The Lead Specialist Finance commented that if a tenant continued not to pay their tenant arrears they would eventually be evicted and the debt would transfer from housing debt to sundry debt. Five evictions had been carried out this year. An eviction could take up to 12 months and was not the preferred option.
- The Council was using an external agency to pursue debt.
- Councillor Shepherd-DuBey asked whether the Council used phone call reminders. The Lead Specialist Finance stated that two additional members of staff had been engaged to phone and remind people of the need for payment.
- It was noted that Tony Newman of HQN had undertaken a review on rent arrears management and 62 recommendations had come out of the review. Councillor Smith asked that the Committee be informed of the status of the recommendations. The Assistant Director Governance commented that this formed part of the action plan. Councillor Smith also asked for information regarding ageing debt and action being taken to reduce this.
- With regards to sundry debt, the Lead Specialist Finance stated that there was currently £4.4m of collectable debt (although £1m of this sat under 30 days).

RESOLVED: That

- 1) the update be noted;
- 2) the Committee be updated on the status of the 62 recommendations on rent arrears management from an external review by Tony Newman of HQN;
- 3) information on sundry debt be sent to the Chairman monthly from the March month end.

52. ERNST & YOUNG 2018/19 AUDIT PLAN

The Committee received the Ernst and Young 2018/19 Audit Plan.

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

- Helen Thompson highlighted the audit risks and areas of focus. IFRS 9 financial instruments and IFRS 15 Revenue from contracts with customers, were new areas of

focus. However, it was expected that they would not have a material impact on the Council. In response to a question from Councillor Howe, Helen Thompson explained why misstatements due to fraud or error had been included as the first area of focus.

- Materiality had been set at £6.9m which represented 2% of the prior year's gross expenditure on provision of services. Councillor Shepherd-DuBey questioned whether 2% was normal and was informed that it was.
- Members were reminded that Ernst and Young would report all uncorrected misstatements relating to the primary statements; comprehensive income and expenditure statement, balance sheet, movement in reserves statement, cash flow statement, housing revenue account and collection fund greater than £348k.
- The duty to prescribe audit fees was a statutory function delegated to Public Sector Audit Appointments Ltd. It was noted that the fees for 2018/19 were a significant reduction on those for 2017/18. Councillor Sargeant asked whether resources would decrease as a result. Helen Thompson commented that Ernst and Young were looking at efficiencies in the audit and would be making greater use of the offshore teams. The fee reduction would be challenging but the aim was to deliver the audit within the fee.

RESOLVED: That the Ernst & Young 2018/19 Audit Plan be noted.

53. CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

The Director of Children's Services presented the Corporate Risk Register.

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

- The Director Children's Services outlined some of the key risks relating to Children's Services.
- Nationally, safeguarding children was a key risk.
- The Director Children's Services indicated that Ofsted inspections were also highly likely, high impact risks. A new framework for inspection of the SEN provision had been introduced and as such the Council was anticipating the Ofsted of both its SEN provision and mainstream provision, at some stage this year. Children's Services was currently preparing for Ofsted. Members were advised that the service was currently rated 'Requires Improvement'. Self-evaluation put the service still at 'Requires Improvement' with some positives. There was a stable leadership team in place and a positive direction of travel and vision. Councillor Shepherd-DuBey asked how the service could move to 'Good.' The Director Children's Services commented that whilst caseloads had reduced they needed to reduce further.
- Workforce development was a specific risk for Children's Services. Nationally there were issues with regards to the recruitment and retention of social workers.
- Councillor Smith asked what risks were presently on departmental risk register that may escalate to the Corporate Risk Register. The Director Children's Services indicated that workforce stability specific to Children's Services may need to be escalated to the Corporate Risk Register in future.
- In response to a question from Councillor Sargeant as to what work was being carried out regarding recruitment and retention, the Director Children's Services stated that a recruitment and retention plan was being developed and a Task and Finish Group chaired by the Executive Member was looking at the recruitment and retention of social workers. Focus groups would be held in March at which managers and staff would be asked what made a difference to them.
- In response to questions from Councillors Howe and Shepherd-DuBey, the Director Children's Services commented that 40% of children in the Borough with Special

Educational Needs were placed outside of the Borough. Work was being done to try to reduce this.

- In response to a question from Councillor Shepherd-DuBey the Director Children's Services indicated that there were different safeguarding responsibilities around vulnerable adults and children.
- Members noted that some risks had not yet been allocated a committee to monitor its progress and asked that this be updated.
- The Committee asked that the Chief Executive be invited to the next meeting to update Members on risks in their area.

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

54. TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY 2019/20

The Lead Specialist Finance presented the Treasury Management Strategy.

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

- Under the Council's Constitution the Audit Committee was required to agree the Treasury Management Strategy and policies prior to recommendations being made to the Executive and Council. Councillor Smith questioned why this was the case and suggested that this be reviewed by the Constitution Review Working Group.
- The Lead Specialist Finance highlighted that the length of time the Council could invest with other local authorities had increased to 732 days. Local authorities were underwritten by central government.
- The Council's commercial activities had been split out, increasing openness.
- In response to a question from Councillor Sargeant, the Lead Specialist Finance explained why elements of the Minimum Revenue Policy deviated from statutory guidance.
- Members identified a number of spelling and casting errors and asked that these be amended.
- Councillor Smith commented that the Treasury Mid Term report had identified that there had been delays in some areas such as the delivery of infrastructure and the provision of affordable housing, meaning that spending against those projects had been pushed back. He went on state that it would be useful to see information regarding a range of scenarios on the Council's likely borrowing levels.

RESOLVED: That

- 1) the Audit Committee recommend to Council for approval the following:
 - a) Capital Prudential indicators, 2019/20;
 - b) Borrowing strategy 2019/20;
 - c) Annual Investment Strategy 2019/20;
 - d) Flexible use of capital receipts strategy;
 - e) MRP policy; and
 - f) Treasury indicators: limits to borrowing activity 2019/20

Subject to the amendment of various spelling and casting errors and the inclusion of information regarding potential borrowing scenarios.

55. 2018/19 INTERNAL AUDIT AND INVESTIGATION Q3 PROGRESS REPORT

RESOLVED: That this item be deferred to the Committee's next meeting.

56. 2019/20 INTERNAL AUDIT AND INVESTIGATION PLAN

The Committee received the 2019/20 Internal Audit and Investigation Plan.

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

- The Assistant Director Governance commented that the Committee could highlight any areas of concern throughout the year that they felt that Internal Audit and Investigations should consider.
- Councillor Sargeant stated that it would be helpful if a column detailing when a matter had last been audited if it had been audited more than one year ago, was included.

RESOLVED: That the 2019/20 Internal Audit and Investigation Plan be approved.

57. ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN DECIDES ARE URGENT

Councillor Smith informed the Committee that the Constitution Review Working Group had requested that the Audit Committee review a proposed change around the acceptance of Tenders and signing of Documents, in 6 months' time.

Councillor Smith also informed the Committee that he had been asked by the Executive Member for Finance and Corporate Resources to lead a working group to review the council tax reduction scheme process and to report back prior to 21 February. Councillor Shepherd-DuBey volunteered to be part of the working group.

Please note: amendments were made to these minutes at the meeting held on 11 March 2019

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE COMMUNITY AND CORPORATE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE HELD ON 11 FEBRUARY 2019 FROM 7.00 PM TO 9.45 PM

Committee Members Present

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

Substitutes Present: Malcolm Richards substituting for Bill Soane

Other Councillors Present

Councillors: Andy Croy and Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey

Officers Present

Tom Beck (Highways & Transport Consultant), Neil Carr (Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist), Robert Curtis (Transport Planning Team Manager), Graham Ebers (Deputy Chief Executive), Matt Gould (Lead Specialist, Highways & Transport), Bob Watson (Finance Lead Specialist) and Callum Wernham (Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist)

44. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted from Dianne King and Bill Soane.

45. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

46. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

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

47.1 John Booth asked the Chairman of the Community and Corporate Overview & Scrutiny Committee the following question. The question was asked on his behalf by Jennifer Lissaman, and answered by Councillor David Sleight.

Question

Public Question from John Booth for Councillor Sleight with reference to Items 51 and 52 on the Agenda:

I recall a newspaper headline from my youth – “Plan for Buses to Feed Trains”.

Use of private cars to access the railway stations can aggravate congestion, air quality and climate changing emissions.

For the individual the cost of running a car that is primarily used for commuting and spends most of its time in a station car park or outside their home is very high if better options can be made available.

Using valuable land and public funds to provide car parking in urban areas near stations must offer questionable value when the environmental and financial costs of greater car use are taken into account.

There is a Friends of the Earth Briefing paper on transforming public transport on this link <https://policy.friendsoftheearth.uk/sites/files/policy/documents/2019-02/free-buses-under->

Please note: amendments were made to these minutes at the meeting held on 11 March 2019

30s.pdf which advocates radical changes to provision of bus services including free buses for the under-30s.

Will the Council look again at improving bus services to improve access between homes and the railway stations as an alternative to expanding station car parks and park and ride schemes?

Answer

Thank you for your question. Railway stations in Wokingham Borough are already well served by buses with the exceptions of Twyford and Wargrave. In the latter case the village is arguably better served by its existing bus services rather than its station which is on the western edge of the village. The general question of access to Twyford Station following the changes to services on the Great Western Main Line will be considered by the Committee when formulating its recommendations on Item 51.

As I hope Mr Booth will acknowledge, Wokingham Borough Council has worked with the bus operators to provide an excellent bus/rail interchange in Wokingham. The A329 runs parallel to the railway and access to Winnersh, Winnersh Triangle and Earley Stations from the Nos 4 and X4 bus services is possible – if the customer wishes to interchange.

We note the suggestion for free bus travel for under 30s and, indeed, we are aware of plans in various European cities such as Luxembourg City to make public transport free to reduce traffic congestion and improve air quality. The extension of free transport is a choice for funders and this needs a wider debate than is appropriate to this Committee.

Finally Wokingham Borough Council sees the need to consider critically the expansion of Park & Ride provision to ensure that it offers both value for money and is the optimum solution to address the perceived problems. That is why a review of the Coppid Beech Park & Ride scheme has been included at Item 52 but it would be wrong to prejudge the conclusions and recommendations of the Committee on this Agenda item.

48. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

There were no Member questions.

49. BUDGET SCRUTINY BRIEFING

The Committee received a briefing, set out in agenda pages 5 to 148, which gave an overview of the Council's budget setting process, timelines and figures from the 2018/19 financial year.

Bob Watson, Lead Finance Specialist, stated that the Council's budget was a financial representation of the Council's strategy and priorities. He added that the budget was the way that the Council could facilitate providing its services to residents. Bob explained the difference between revenue (day to day expenditure, for example Officer salaries) and capital (capital asset creation and enhancement etc.) expenditure, and added that revenue could be used to contribute to the capital budget, but not vice versa.

Bob stated that with revenue budget setting, it was important to work out what the Council could afford to provide, taking into account statutory services including refuse collection and providing a safe environment for adults and children. Graham Ebers, Deputy Chief Executive, highlighted that one of the key differences between a private company and a Local Authority was that a Local Authority has to provide a range of statutory services (from their revenue budget), which left them with much less flexibility within their revenue

Please note: amendments were made to these minutes at the meeting held on 11 March 2019

budget. Graham added that there was, comparatively, much more room within a Local Authorities capital budget.

Bob Watson described the two forms of budget, incremental and zero based. Bob explained that an incremental budget adjusted the previous years' budget for costs such as inflation, growth and efficiencies as well as for one off payments. He added that a zero based budget rebased the budget to meet the specific service needs. Bob stated that Wokingham Borough Council's (WBC) planned approach was to use an incremental budget, of which 85% was used to provide statutory services. Bob stated that the service budgets belonged to service heads (for example, the Executive Member and Director of the relevant service) who delivered the frontline services to residents.

Bob outlined an approximate timetable for the budget setting process which read as follows:

May – Start to think about growth, efficiencies and income generation;

September - Staffing, fees & charges;

November – Non-staffing, finalise staffing and fees & charges;

December – Complete the medium term financial plan (MTFP), work out the Council Tax base and agree the draft settlement;

January – Finalise the MTFP, seek agreement from the relevant committees;

February – Final settlement, seek agreement at budget Council, Council tax set.

Bob outlined that fees and charges were set to:

- Recover costs where possible;
- Manage supply and demand;
- Cover inflationary increases;
- Cover some statutory/overrides.

Bob Watson explained the process for revenue monitoring was to send regular 'hot off the press' revenue monitoring updates to the Corporate Leadership Team (CLT) and the Joint Board for evaluation. Bob added that these meetings gave the opportunity to identify early warning signs within service budgets, such as overspend or underspend.

Rachel Burgess queried (with relation to agenda page 164) whether the general fund balance was indicative of issues within the overall sustainability of the Council's finances. In response, Graham Ebers stated that the priority was to reduce the service budget variance as much as possible (for example, adult social care had been reduced from £1.5M to £500K from year start), however services such as children's services were continuing to require more resources. He added that it was crucial to monitor in year variances so that these could be factored in to growth in the following years' budget.

Rachel Burgess queried the sustainability of the MTFP, and why no inflationary costs were applied to School Block funding (referring to agenda page 121). In response, Graham Ebers stated that the Council was making progress to become more self-sufficient via generating income where possible, and to make early interventions a priority to address issues before they became more problematic. He added that the Council was continuing to make representations to Central Government regarding funding. With regards to the schools block query, Bob Watson stated that as more schools chose to become academies, the Council's funding levels for schools would drop proportionately. Graham Ebers added that, on average, per pupil funding levels had increased 2.3% per year,

Please note: amendments were made to these minutes at the meeting held on 11 March 2019

however this could have resulted in a small negative real growth in funding due to the tough settlement that schools had received in recent years.

Shahid Younis asked how much of the business rates were retained by WBC, and what experiences the Council had with involving the public in the budget setting process. Grahame Ebers stated that WBC were due to keep £13M (from a total £60M) in business rates, which could be reduced to £6M kept by WBC with a negative rates grant applied by Central Government. Graham stated that WBC had previously ran budget engagement events with some degree of success, however these events tended to only attract a small number of residents (300 to 400 people). Graham added that engagement via online means had also been trialled, again with limited success. Graham stated that the views from residents were fed into the budget setting process, and that it was important to engage with residents to help educate and inform them about Local Authority finance.

Clive Jones queried whether there was provision for an increase in the schools block budget (with reference to agenda page 153). Graham Ebers stated that there were growing financial pressures within maintained schools such as the provision of special educational needs. He added that WBC needed to continue making representations to Central Government to highlight the escalating costs in these areas.

Clive Jones asked whether the budget had been adjusted due to the increased costs of future planning appeals. Graham Ebers stated that known specific events would be covered either by an earmarked reserve or by the general reserve. Clive stated that some other Councils involved their scrutiny Committees in the budget process during the autumn, and asked for the Officer's views on this. Graham Ebers stated that different Local Authorities had different methods of preparing and reviewing their budget proposals. He added that there was a difference between sharing the process of budget setting and sharing the detail of the budget. Graham stated that WBC could look at how other Local Authorities involve their Committees in the budget setting process going forward.

Andy Croy queried why the budget estimates for the schools block budget (with reference to agenda page 121) was 'flat lined' beyond the next financial year. Bob Watson stated that the Department for Education (DFE) do not give forward notification beyond one year, and therefore WBC presumes no additional income from the DFE.

Rachel Burgess queried the lack of increase to council tax in 2012/13 and 2015/16, highlighting that there would be a loss in terms of compounding increases in future years. Graham Ebers stated that Central Government had implemented a Council Tax freeze grant in some previous years, which had allowed WBC not to increase Council Tax in those years.

Guy Grandison queried when the approximate values for the Council Tax base are prepared. Graham Ebers stated that the data (for example, the number of new builds) was collated in November or December and undergoes a statutory calculation.

The Committee discussed the process of budget scrutiny during the 2019/20 municipal yea. These suggestions included:

- Asking the relevant Executive Members to attend the Committee to clarify budget areas and pressures;
- Checking in-year whether the assumptions made within the MTFP were being met;
- Evaluating the in-year process for budget setting.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) Bob Watson and Graham Ebers be thanked for attending the meeting;
- 2) the Committee consider a timeline for conducting a review of the 2020/21 budget setting process;
- 3) Members of the Committee contact Democratic Services with any specific areas of the budget or budget setting process that they would be interested in scrutinising;
- 4) budget Scrutiny be placed on the 2019/20 Committee work programme.

50. REVENUE AND CAPITAL MONITORING

This item was agreed by the Committee to be combined with item 49, the previous agenda item, and as such the minutes and resolutions to item 49 apply to item 50.

51. IMPACT OF PLANNED RAIL CHANGES (COUNCILLOR SLEIGHT REPORT)

The Committee considered a report, set out in agenda pages 177 to 192, which gave an overview of the of the train services operating within the Borough.

The report outlined the following topics:

- The demand for rail had doubled in the past 20 years, and was due to double again in the next 10 to 15 years;
- The Borough has a total of 7 railway lines operated by 2 train companies;
- The Local Authority could part fund the regeneration or construction of train stations in a joint capacity with Network Rail;
- Engaging in consultations with the Department for Transport (DfT) was very important to input WBC's response into railway issues and to have an input on proposed timetable changes;
- Old Oak Common was the largest regeneration project in the UK, including a railway station with planned access to Twyford, High Speed 2 (HS2) in 2026 and a Western Rail link to Heathrow in approximately 2028;
- The Reading to Basingstoke line passes through the Borough for approximately 1km, with the possibility of a new station at Grazeley serviceing this line;
- Wargrave was the Borough's quietest station (by capacity);
- The potential impacts (relating to the railway service) that the Borough faces include station access, level crossing viability, station facilities and bus service interface.

Robert Curtis, Transport Planning Team Manager, highlighted to the Committee the Officer responses to Cllr Sleight's report, as set out on agenda pages 178 and 179.

Shahid Younis asked what progress was being made with regards to parking at Twyford station. David Sleight stated that there was a conservation area nearby the station and that a solution to the parking situation was still in the process of being identified.

Members raised concern about the rising costs of rail fares. David Sleight stated that travelling to London via Twyford rather than via Reading/Paddington came at a significant saving to the commuter.

Please note: amendments were made to these minutes at the meeting held on 11 March 2019

Members queried whether Reading buses could run a service to Twyford station. David Sleight stated that this would be a commercial decision to be made by Reading Buses.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) David Sleight and Rob Curtis be thanked for attending the meeting;
- 2) the report on the impact of planned rail changes (and Officer responses) be noted;
- 3) the Committee continue to support and encourage the Executive Member with responsibility for Highways and Transport to engage with the DfT, Network Rail and the operating companies on consultation opportunities.

52. COPPID BEECH PARK AND RIDE

The Committee considered a report, set out in agenda pages 193 to 242, which outlined the strategic outline business case for the proposed Coppid Beech Park and Ride.

The report outlined the following key points:

- The park and ride had formed a part of WBC's core strategy since 2010;
- The land has been allocated for a park and ride scheme;
- The park and ride's main focus would be for the use of existing bus services, with an approximate 4 services per hour into Wokingham town centre;
- The current business case did not currently propose a route to Reading;
- The benefit cost ratio was 'over 2' on the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP), which would allow a full business case to be developed and brought forward in future.

David Sleight queried why the cost per space of the proposed park and ride was less than the cost per space of the existing Thames Valley Park (TVP) and Ride. Tom Beck, Highways & Transport Consultant, stated that the TVP park and ride had undulating ground and therefore had additional costs in making the land fit for purpose.

David Sleight queried the viability of the proposed park and ride using only existing bus services. Tom Beck, Highways & Transport Consultant, stated that the main focus of the proposed park and ride was a transport service to the Wokingham town centre. He added that approximately four buses per hour would pass through the site, and WBC would cooperate with Reading Buses to explore other potential bus services using the proposed site. Tom stated that parking provision in the Wokingham town centre was constrained, and the proposed park and ride would residents another option to access the town centre.

Rachel Burgess asked what evidence was available that showed that people would switch to using a park and ride service. Tom Beck stated that evidence showed that approximately ten percent of people paying for parking (in the Wokingham town centre) would switch to use the proposed park and ride.

Members raised concerns over the viability of the proposed park and ride scheme should it only use existing bus services.

Matt Gould, Lead Specialist - Highways & Transport, stated that the business case would be scrutinised by 3rd parties and the LEP was committed to the scheme, dependant on the next business case. Matt added that the current indications were that the proposed

Please note: amendments were made to these minutes at the meeting held on 11 March 2019

scheme was viable, and that it linked with the other major highways infrastructure projects proposed within the core strategy.

Mike Haines noted the structure of other local park and ride schemes, and queried whether the proposed scheme would provide the same level of infrastructure. Tom Beck stated that there were 'different tiers' of park and rides, and that the relatively small distance between the town centre and the proposed park and ride would therefore require less services than a comparatively larger park and ride.

The Committee were concerned with a variety of aspects of the current business case, and asked that the next business case came back to the Committee.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) Matt Gould and Tom Beck be thanked for attending the Committee;
- 2) Democratic Services liaise with the Highways team to keep the Committee informed on the development of the next business case;
- 3) the next business case be brought back to the Committee in the next municipal year;
- 4) the report and associated strategic outline business case be noted.

53. WORK PROGRAMME 2018/19

The Committee considered a report, set out in agenda pages 243 to 247, which gave details of the Committee's proposed work programme for future meetings.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) an update on the car parking strategy policy be taken to the March Committee;
- 2) Members notify Democratic Services of any potential scrutiny items to be included in the 2019/20 Committee work programme.

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD ON 13 FEBRUARY 2019 FROM 7.00 PM TO 9.55 PM**

Committee Members Present

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

Councillors Present and Speaking

Councillors: Abdul Loyes and Anthony Pollock

Officers Present

Connor Corrigan, Service Manager – Strategic Development Locations, Planning Delivery
Judy Kelly, Highways Development Manager
Mary Severin, Borough Solicitor
Callum Wernham, Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist

Case Officers Present

Laura Callan
Christopher Howard
Kayleigh Mansfield
Simon Taylor

69. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence.

70. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 9 January 2019 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.

71. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

John Jarvis declared a personal prejudicial interest in agenda items 73 and 74, on the grounds that he was involved in an ongoing personal dispute with the developer, Bellway Homes. He stated that he would leave the room for the duration of these items and would take no part in the discussions or votes.

Chris Bowring declared a conflict of interests in agenda item 76, on the grounds that he was the Deputy Executive Member for Regeneration. He stated that he would leave the room for the duration of this item and would take no part in the discussion or vote.

72. APPLICATIONS TO BE DEFERRED AND WITHDRAWN ITEMS

Following the decision to refuse planning permission for application number 181631, it was decided that agenda item 73 (application number 181499) be deferred.

73. APPLICATION NO 181499 - LAND SOUTH OF CUTBUSH LANE, SHINFIELD

The decision was taken to hear agenda item 74 prior to this application. Following the decision to refuse planning permission for agenda item 74 (application number

181631), it was decided that agenda item 73 (application number 181499) be deferred.

74. APPLICATION NO 181631 - LAND SOUTH OF READING ROAD AND ARBORFIELD ROAD, EAST OF CHESTNUT CRESCENT, WEST OF THE RIVER LODDON

John Jarvis left the room for the duration of this item.

Proposal: Full planning application for the change of use of 21.7ha of land from agricultural use to informal recreational land (Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace SANG) and associated infrastructure including pedestrian and vehicle access, a car park, footpath network and landscaping.

Applicant: University of Reading.

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 105 to 120.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- An updated set of head terms with regards to the legal agreement;
- A set of conditions and informatives;
- An updated part C, 'Reasons for Refusal';
- Clarification that the Parish Council had not provided any further comments on the application.

Nina Sharp, Agent, spoke in support of the application. She stated that the application was for a change of use of 21.7 hectares of agricultural land to a Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG). Nina added that the nearby Langley Mead SANG had a high visitor count and was popular with local residents. Nina stated that the proposed application was situated in flood zones 1, 2 and 3, however Natural England had assessed the overall viability of the land and had deemed it to be acceptable with a variety of 'must have' features including a variety of environments, a circular walkway, an easy to access car park and space suitable for dog walking (without leads). Nina added that Natural England had given their full support for the proposed scheme.

Anthony Pollock, Ward Member, spoke in objection to the application. He stated that the proposed development site was currently under water due to flooding, and was of the opinion that local residents were becoming increasingly frustrated with local SANGs being placed adjacent to rivers prone to flooding. Anthony added that the river was six foot higher than the base of the land towards the edge of the proposed SANG, and that this stretch of the river had always been prone to overflowing and flooding. Anthony stated that the applicant could not use the land for housing developments, so had instead opted to develop the land as a SANG. Anthony was of the opinion that the proposed 13 car parking spaces were insufficient, and that local residents needed a much higher quality SANG provision in the area.

Connor Corrigan, Service Manager for Strategic Development Locations and Planning Delivery, responded to a number of points raised by the speakers. He stated that it was acknowledged that the proposed development site was prone to flooding (being in flood zones 2 and 3) however this was acceptable as the SANG would not be in constant use especially during times of more extreme weather and had links to a wider SANG. Connor

added that the site had a one in twenty year flood level, and acknowledged that some of the footpaths and part of the proposed car park would flood in 'extreme' events. Connor stated that flooding was accepted to occur on the site and that Natural England supported proposals to create the SANG in a semi-rural setting with links to a wider SANG. With regards to car parking, Connor stated that people were not encouraged to drive to SANGs as they were designed to meet the needs of local residents in surrounding housing developments. He added that the proposed parking plans were supported by Natural England.

A number of Members were concerned with the flooding risks associated with the proposed site and queried how much of the site would be available for use throughout the year. Connor Corrigan stated that it was very difficult to calculate how much the site would flood in the future (citing 2013/14 being an extremely heavy rainfall year where most of the site was flooded for example), but stated that the vast majority of the site should be useable during a normal year, most of the year-round. Connor added that at least half of the land should be useable even during times of flooding, reiterating that this was subject to the specific weather pattern of that year with conditions being worse during the winter.

Wayne Smith queried whether the proposed SANG was based on the original strategic development location (SDL) housing number, or the increased number as result of appeal. Connor Corrigan stated that the proposed SANG was sufficient for the proposed housing developments that would form a part of the SDL and would also provide capacity for future housing provision.

Carl Doran queried why the SANG was proposed to be developed in two phases. Connor Corrigan stated that the SANG would come forward in a two phased approach to accommodate more potential housing developments in the future. He added that the Council had an obligation to judge each proposed scheme on its own merits.

Angus Ross stated that the proposed SANG was in addition to other open spaces for public use. He felt that the benefit of this scheme was to promote walking to a local SANG rather than travelling to an area such as the Thames Basin Heath. Angus added that a large quantity of car parking was not necessary for the proposed SANG as it was intended to be used by local residents (predominantly arriving at the SANG on foot).

In response to Member queries regarding whether this application was linked to agenda item 73, Mary Severin (Borough Solicitor) stated that agenda item 73 required a SANG as a condition of development. Mary emphasised that the application for the SANG stood alone on its own merits. Mary stated that agenda item 73 and 74 were linked in practical terms, however they were not linked in planning terms.

The drainage consultant on behalf of the applicant stated that the site was currently flooded, however during a normal year the vast majority of phase one of the proposed SANG would remain dry. He added that the footpaths would be useable the majority of the time and mechanisms such as board walks could be used in more flooding prone areas to elevate the footpaths.

Wayne Smith proposed that the application be deferred so that a site visit could be conducted to assess the current flooding issues on the site. This was seconded by Carl Doran and upon being put to a vote the motion fell.

Connor Corrigan reiterated to the Committee that Natural England had supported the application after assessing the flooding risk, the land around the proposed SANG and other features of the land. He added that the majority of the footpaths, which include those connecting into the adjacent SANG, would be outside of the flood zones and would remain useable.

Angus Ross stated that this SANG would be an expansion of the existing SANG, and added that parts of the proposed SANG would be further away from the flood zone than the existing Loddon SANG.

Mary Severin asked the Planning Officer to explain the likely outcomes at appeal, should the application be refused. Connor Corrigan was of the opinion that Wokingham Borough Council (WBC) would have very little chance of defending a refusal decision for this application at appeal based on flooding risks, as flooding was intermittent and Natural England should have assessed the risks from the information submitted as part of the application and they supported the proposal. Connor added that there would be significant costs made payable by WBC should a refusal decision be overturned at appeal.

Chris Bowring queried what could be done if the SANG became unsuitable after a period of time. Connor Corrigan stated that appropriate action could be taken, as not doing so would be contrary to European Regulations.

Malcolm Richards queried who would be liable for costs to make the SANG fit for purpose should it be deemed not up to standard after some time. Connor Corrigan stated that the applicant would be liable for the costs as they would be managing it.

Wayne Smith proposed that the application be refused, based on insufficient information presented to the Committee regarding flooding issues and the usability of the land for SANG during flood events. This was seconded by Carl Doran.

Upon being put to a vote it was:

RESOLVED: That application 181631 be refused, based on insufficient information presented to the Committee regarding flooding issues, and the usability of the land for SANG during flood events.

75. APPLICATION NO 180988 - PITT WORKS, COLEMANS MOOR ROAD, WOODLEY

John Jarvis re-entered the room.

Proposal: Full application for the proposed erection of 17 dwellings together with associated vehicular accesses, car parking and landscaping following demolition of the existing dwelling and outbuildings once associated with a former scrapyards use.

Applicant: The Owner and/or Occupier, Copperwood Developments Ltd.

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 121 to 200.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- Amended conditions 2, 10, 23 and 31;

- Additional conditions 36 and 37;
- Clarification of paragraph 37 (page 148);
- Clarification of paragraph 113 (page 159);
- Clarification of trip rates.

Darren Smith, Woodley Town Council, spoke in objection to the application. Darren stated that the application before the Committee was an improvement on the previous plans for 20 dwellings (now down to 17 dwellings). Darren added that the proposed dwellings were too high at two and a half storeys, and that the proposed development was too dense. Darren was of the opinion that the top windows should be obscurely glazed. He added that there were existing issues with parking in the surrounding area, and that the area suffered from flooding issues which would need to be addressed by a suitable flooding protection plan. Darren raised the Town Council's concern that although the parking provision at the proposed development would meet the Council's regulations, some overspill on to the already congested main road could occur. Darren was of the opinion that the two and half storey height of the proposed developments was overbearing compared to the surrounding area.

Chris Mason, Resident, spoke in objection to the application. He stated that he was the resident of one of the neighbouring properties which backed on to the proposed development site. He was of the opinion that it was logical to develop the site, however he was concerned with the density of the application. Chris stated that car parking in the area was already overwhelmed, and that an increase in traffic and car parking from the proposed development would only add to this issue. Chris added that there would be an increase in noise and pollution (compared to its current state of usage), and the development would apply more pressure to local resources such as GP surgeries. Chris was of the opinion that the two and a half storey description of the development was 'clever' as the roof sloped down from its peak height. Chris added that he was concerned about the potential for the proposed dwellings to overlook existing dwellings, and stated his concerns regarding the ground and building contaminants.

Andrew Bandosz, Agent, spoke in favour of the application. He stated that the Case Officer's report had detailed and addressed many of the concerns raised by the Town Council and residents. Andrew added that the proposed development sought to redevelop a former scrapyards, replacing it with 17 residential dwellings. Andrew stated that removal of the contaminated and polluted concrete and earth was positive in planning terms. Andrew added that a scrapyards was not recommended to be situated within a residential area, however there were existing planning rights on the site for extended hours of use as a scrapyards due to the age of site. Andrew stated that the proposed development would be situated within a sustainable urban location, would not harm the local area and was in line with the NPPF.

Abdul Loyes, Ward Member, spoke in objection to the application. He stated that the former use of the site as a scrapyards could have contaminates the site. He added that he was not aware of any tests to identify potential contaminants that had been carried out. Abdul stated that there were flood risks associated with the site, and the proposed development could exacerbate this issue for the surrounding area. Abdul asked that should the application be approved, that appropriate soil (contaminant) testing be conducted and a flood prevention scheme implemented.

Simon Taylor, Case Officer, clarified a number of points raised by speakers. He stated that the height of the proposed dwellings were higher than other properties in the area,

however they were deemed to be acceptable and would not be overdevelopment. Regarding contamination of the site, Simon stated that limited testing could currently be completed as the majority of the site was concrete based. He added that safe disposal of contaminated waste was conditioned. Simon stated that additional details regarding the drainage plans for the site would be submitted at a later date and were conditioned. Simon stated that the site was currently vacant and was therefore not producing noise. He added that there was planning permission to continue its use as a scrapyard. Simon stated that a construction management plan would be implemented to minimise noise and disruption during construction, and that the noise levels from residential use were deemed to be acceptable.

Judy Kelly, Highways Development Manager, stated that the parking provisions at the proposed development met the Council's parking standards, and that the site was estimated to generate approximately nine vehicle movements during peak hours which was deemed acceptable.

Bill Soane stated that a large perimeter fence could be constructed to help obscure possible overlooking to existing properties.

Bill Soane queried whether the concrete base of the site would be disposed of, and whether the sewer below the proposed development could cause any issues. In response Connor Corrigan, Service Manager for Strategic Development Locations and Planning Delivery, stated that any contaminated concrete would be disposed of after testing. Connor stated that the sewer could be potentially moved by Thames Water if it affected development and was suitable to do so. Simon Taylor added that a £60,000 budget had been allocated by the developer for the removal of the existing concrete at the proposed development site.

The Committee made it clear that they were concerned with the lack of affordable housing provision at the proposed development. Connor Corrigan stated that an independent viability assessment had been carried out, which took in to account expenses such as demolition and safe disposal of contaminated waste. Connor added that this assessment had been conducted by a specialist and had been thoroughly checked. Officers relied on this professional assessment to make a decision. The assessment concluded that the developer would make approximately 10% profit on the proposed development, which was low compared to most developments and therefore it was not viable to provide affordable housing on site.

Carl Doran stated that the National Planning Policy Guidance stated that a viability assessment (or an executive summary thereof) should be published publically. Mary Severin, Borough Solicitor, stated that the assessment was conducted by a professional in that field, and that confidential financial information could form a part of the assessment, which could affect future contracts for the developer. Simon Taylor stated that Wokingham Borough Council's (WBC) review of the assessment had been published online, however the applicant's initial report had not. Carl Doran was of the opinion that this was contrary to the NPPF.

Malcolm Richards queried whether the developer could have provided a smaller percentage of on-site affordable housing than the standard 30%. Connor Corrigan stated that the assessment concluded that the profits would fall under the accepted rate of return, which allowed the developer to make a case that they could not afford to provide any affordable housing.

Bill Soane queried whether there was room for emergency vehicles to access the proposed development. Judy Kelly stated that there were no concerns that vehicles such as fire response vehicles would not be able to access the site.

Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey queried whether the roads would be adopted by WBC. Judy Kelly stated that the roads would be built to an adoptable standard, but that it was the developer's decision as to whether they became adopted roads or not.

Members reiterated their concerns regarding the lack of affordable housing provisions within the proposed development. Connor Corrigan clarified that a professional viability assessment had been carried out and had concluded that the development site was not financially viable for the developer to provide affordable housing.

Angus Ross suggested that Bill Soane's request for additional fencing height be conditioned. Connor Corrigan stated that boundary treatment was already a consideration and conditioned, and added that this would be revised and agreed by the Head of Development Management, the Chair of Planning Committee and the Ward Members when finalised.

RESOLVED: That application 180988 be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in agenda pages 122 to 136, amended conditions 2, 10, 23, 31 and additional conditions 36 and 37 as set out in the Members' Update, and the condition of boundary treatment being agreed by the Head of Development Management, the Chair of Planning Committee and the Ward Members when finalised.

**76. APPLICATION NO 182460 - WEST FOREST GATE WELLINGTON ROAD/
FINCHAMPSTEAD, WOKINGHAM**

Chris Bowring left the room for the duration of this item.

Proposal: Full planning application for demolition of existing B1 (office) building and the erection of 2 buildings to provide 49 apartments, car parking, vehicular and pedestrian access and landscaping.

Applicant: Webb Core Offices.

The Committee received and reviewed a report about this application, set out in agenda pages 201 to 246.

The Committee were advised that the Members' Update included:

- Additional clarification regarding parking provision;
- Replacement of condition 18 (travel plan) with a condition regarding electric vehicle charging;
- Additional clarification regarding the car club.

The Committee raised concerns over the lack of affordable housing provision at the proposed development. Laura Callan, Case Officer, clarified that a viability assessment had been undertaken and had concluded that it was not financially viable for the developer to provide affordable housing on site.

Carl Doran was of the opinion that the application was contrary to CP15 (loss of floor space), and felt that the parking was insufficient. Laura Callan stated that part of the existing office buildings were vacant, and the owner had struggled for some time to find a permanent occupier for the entirety of the building, and therefore there would not be a real terms loss of floor space.

In response to Member questions regarding the viability of a car club, Judy Kelly, Highways Development Manager, stated that the site was considered a sustainable location for a car club to be implemented. Laura Callan added that a full car parking management strategy would be secured by condition.

In response to further Member queries regarding the car club, Judy Kelly stated that a similar scheme was available in Montague Park and was currently working well. Judy added that financial contributions from the developer would be put towards extending and improving the car club provision. Judy stated that more detail on the car club would be developed at a later date.

Malcolm Richards raised concerns regarding congestion in the area, particularly at a local roundabout. Judy Kelly stated that the increased number of vehicle movements as a result of the proposed development were deemed acceptable.

RESOLVED: That application 182460 be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives as set out in agenda pages 202 to 210 and replaced condition 18 as set out in the Members' Update.

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
WOKINGHAM BOROUGH WELLBEING BOARD
HELD ON 14 FEBRUARY 2019 FROM 5.00 PM TO 6.45 PM**

Present

Parry Batth	Wokingham Borough Council
Nick Campbell-White	Healthwatch
Philip Cook	Voluntry Sector and Community Partnership
Tessa Lindfield	Strategic Director Public Health Berkshire
Dr Cathy Winfield	NHS Berkshire West CCG
Paul Doherty (substituting Carol Cammiss)	Assistant Director Education
Martin Sloan (substituting Angela Morris)	Assistant Director Adult Services

Also Present:

Madeleine Shopland	Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist
UllaKarin Clark	Deputy Chief Executive
Graham Ebers	Public Health
Rhosyn Harris	Wellbeing Board Manager
Charlotte Seymour	Independent Chairman of the West of Berkshire Safeguarding Adults Board
Teresa Bell	

44. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

RESOLVED: That Councillor Parry Batth be elected Chairman for the remainder of the municipal year.

45. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted from Councillors David Hare, Pauline Helliard Symons and Julian McGhee-Sumner, Carol Cammiss, Sarah Hollamby, Dr Debbie Milligan, Angela Morris and Katie Summers.

46. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Board held on 8 November 2019 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

47. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Tessa Lindfield declared a Personal Interest in Item 67 Data Available for service planning for veterans and the delivery of the Armed Force Covenant on the grounds that her husband served in the Armed Forces.

48. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no public questions.

49. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

There were no Member questions.

50. APPOINTMENT TO WOKINGHAM BOROUGH WELLBEING BOARD

The Board considered a report proposing the appointment of the Deputy Chief Executive to the Wokingham Borough Wellbeing Board.

RESOLVED: That

- 1) the Deputy Chief Executive (from Wokingham Borough Council) be appointed to the Wokingham Borough Wellbeing Board.
- 2) it be recommended to Council, via the Constitution Review Working Group that section 4.4.23 of the Council's Constitution be amended to reflect the change in the Wokingham Borough Wellbeing Board membership.

51. WEST OF BERKSHIRE SAFEGUARDING ADULTS BOARD ANNUAL REPORT 2017-18

Teresa Bell, Independent Chairman of the West of Berkshire Safeguarding Adults Board, presented the West of Berkshire Safeguarding Adults Board Annual Report 2017-18.

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

- The establishment of a Safeguarding Adults Board was statutory under the Care Act 2014.
- Core duties of the Board included undertaking safeguarding adults reviews, producing an annual report and producing a business plan.
- Board members were informed that the number of safeguarding concerns reported had reduced across Berkshire West. Work was being undertaken to establish the cause of this. It was noted that there were slight differences in the way the triage system was operated in the three areas in Berkshire West. Common methodology in order to avoid disparity was being encouraged.
- There had been little change in the referral for safeguarding enquiry pattern. People were mostly over 65, many were female and the majority were white.
- The most common type of abuse across Berkshire West was neglect, followed by physical abuse.
- There had been an increase in self-neglect cases. Dr Winfield questioned whether this was linked to social isolation. Teresa Bell indicated that it was in some cases but in others people were very independent and did not wish to accept help. She went on to state that it would be helpful to explore the matter further with Public Health.
- Councillor Batth questioned why less referrals were being received from ethnic minorities. Teresa Bell commented that the level of referrals from ethnic minorities was not high in Berkshire West, even in Reading which had a larger ethnic community. The Board was focusing on engaging with local community groups. Tessa Lindfield suggested that the Board could learn good practice from other areas regarding engaging with people from ethnic minorities and encouraging them to make a safeguarding enquiry when required. Councillor Clark commented that a language barrier may be an issue in some cases when it came to considering making a report.

RESOLVED: That the West of Berkshire Safeguarding Adults Board Annual Report 2017-18 be noted.

52. DATA AVAILABLE FOR SERVICE PLANNING FOR VETERANS AND THE DELIVERY OF THE ARMED FORCES COVENANT

Rhosyn Harris, Public Health, presented a report regarding data available for service planning for veterans and the delivery of the Armed Forces Covenant.

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

- Estimates suggested that there were 1,720 working- aged (aged 16-64) Armed Forces veterans living in Wokingham Borough. A veteran could be anyone who had served in the Armed Forces for a day or more. Younger veterans in particular may not recognise themselves as such.
- Consideration of veterans' needs in the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment was key to ensuring that the commitment to local veterans set out in the Armed Forces Covenant was fulfilled.
- The Board was informed that health services for Armed Forces were commissioned by a number of different bodies.
- Board members were provided with information around the number of veterans in the Borough. It was noted that veterans could be in receipt of the Armed Forces Pension or registered with their GP as a veteran. The Clinical Commissioning Group had actively sought information regarding the number of veterans in the Borough, asking people attending for a flu vaccination whether they had served in the Armed Forces.
- Compared with the England averages, working-aged veterans living in Wokingham Borough were estimated to have better health, were more likely to be home owners and hold higher education qualifications and were less likely to be unemployed.
- Compared with the rest of the population veterans tended to be fit and healthy but reported higher levels of smoking prevalence, depressive illness, hearing loss and muscular skeletal problems.
- Graham Ebers commented that it was important to recognise that the JSNA was an evolving document and that the data regarding veterans could help shape the JSNA and the Wellbeing Strategy.

RESOLVED: That

- 1) the newly published data released by ONS/MoD be considered;
- 2) the call to action from the NHS Director of Health & Justice, Armed Forces and Sexual Assault Services Commissioning and Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Mental Health, Inequalities and Suicide Prevention, specifically that veterans should be considered in JSNA refresh, to note the recent publication of "Our Community, Our Covenant" a guide for local authorities to support the delivery of the Armed Forces Covenant and to note the availability of the Covenant Fund, be considered.

53. GUIDING PRINCIPLES, WOKINGHAM INTEGRATED PARTNERSHIP

The Board considered the Guiding Principles: Wokingham Integrated Partnership.

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

- The Guiding Principles had been developed by the Council and partners for working together for the provision of integrated adult health and social care services. It was a light touch agreement and not legally binding.
- Nick Campbell White was of the view that the governance structure and some of the names of the various Board was overly complex and confusing. Dr Winfield indicated that work was being done on the governance structure and the outcome of which could be reported back to the Wellbeing Board.

RESOLVED: That the Guiding Principles be agreed and endorsed and it be recognised that it was an important and significant step in the development of a new collaborative partnership for health and social care in Wokingham.

54. BETTER CARE FUND QUARTER 3 REPORT

Martin Sloan, Assistant Director Adult Services, presented the Better Care Fund Quarter 3 report.

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

- Each Better Care Fund was required to submit quarterly reports to NHS England and the Ministry for Housing, Community and Local Government. These were signed off by the Wellbeing Board.
- There were 4 national metrics that the Better Care Fund was measured against;
 - *Reduction in Non-Elective Admissions (NEAs)* – although this target was not being met Wokingham performed very well in this area;
 - *Rate of Permanent admissions to care homes* – this target was on track;
 - *Proportion of older people (aged over 65) who are still at home 91 days after discharge from hospital into reablement/rehabilitation services* – Although this target was on track to be met, Martin Sloan explained that this target only took into account those referred to social care for reablement services whereas many of those who were referred for reablement services from Royal Berkshire Hospital, were referred to Berkshire Healthcare NHS Trust.
 - *Delayed Transfers of Care (DToC)* – this target was on track.
- Paul Doherty asked how much the Better Care Fund would be next year. Martin Sloan indicated that it was not currently known although it was hoped that it would be similar to current levels of approximately £10million. Approximately £8million would go towards core services and £2million would be allocated to invest in particular areas. A review was carried out each year to ensure that money was being spent in the right areas.

RESOLVED: That the performance of the Better Care Fund in Q3 2018/19 be noted.

55. UPDATE FROM BOARD MEMBERS

The Board received an update on the work of the following Board members.

Community Safety Partnership:

- Charlotte Seymour outlined the Partnership's priorities and the next steps that would be taken.

Healthwatch Wokingham Borough:

- Nick Campbell-White indicated that Healthwatch's main priority would be mental health, particularly the transition from children's to adults' mental health services. Healthwatch would be working with the Citizens Advice Bureau on this matter.
- Healthwatch had agreed nine small projects from organisations including Relax Kids and Age Concern Twyford, from its Community Chest to fund engagement with the hard to reach for the provision of integrated adult health and social care services. An event to celebrate the projects would be held on 25 March.

Place and Community Partnership and Voluntary Sector:

- Philip Cook indicated that he would seek further clarification about the position of the Place and Community Partnership.
- With regards to the Voluntary Sector he went on to update the Board on the restructure of Involve and the service it offered.

RESOLVED: That the updates from Board members be noted.

56. THE NHS LONG TERM PLAN - SUMMARY

Dr Winfield provided a presentation on a summary of the NHS Long Term Plan.

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

- The Plan had been published in January and was the plan for the NHS for the next 5-10 years.
- The Plan outlined a 21st century model for care, the aims of which were to provide more joined up and better co-ordinated care, more proactive care and being more differentiated in the support of individuals.
- Various actions would be taken to achieve this including boosting out of hospital care. Nationally £4bn would be invested to help achieve this.
- In addition there was a desire to reduce the pressure on emergency hospital services, to better promote more personalised care and to increase digitally enabled primary and outpatient care.
- There would be a greater focus on population health. Berkshire West was piloting a population health system working around the frail elderly.
- Primary care networks and their role in boosting out of hospital care was highlighted. Dr Winfield indicated that primary care networks would be developed covering approximately 30-40,000 patients. The network would be contracted and a single fund would be in place hosted by a single practice within the network.
- Practices would be staffed by a wide range of staff including clinical physicians, social prescribers and first contact physios. There would be expanded neighbourhood teams for wider services such as district nurses. Board members were also informed of the development of community hubs for a range of integrated locality services.
- It was noted that GP practices could hold some appointments back which could be used by NHS 111 to refer directly to GPs, to help improve the use of NHS 111. If they were not used they could be released back for general use.
- Reducing unwarranted variations between practices would also be considered.
- Measures to help reduce pressure on emergency hospital services included working to reduce ambulance handover times.
- The Plan focused more on working at a higher level footprint. Dr Winfield referred to ICS, Place, Locality and Neighbourhoods. Martin Sloan commented that Berkshire West and the local authority were currently working well on the integration of health and social care. He expressed concern that should the focus shift to working on a larger scale Wokingham's voice may not be heard. Dr Winfield stated that the arrangements for Berkshire West were unlikely to change greatly. It was sensible to address some matters such as workforce and digitalisation, at a larger scale, but the majority of matters would continue to be dealt with at 'Place' level (Berkshire West).
- Dr Winfield referred to the 'Design our Neighbourhoods' around population health management,
- Tessa Lindfield emphasised that she felt that the Plan provided an opportunity to maximise the prevention agenda.

- In response to a question from Paul Doherty, Dr Winfield clarified that much of the money attached to the NHS Long Term Plan was revenue.
- Philip Cook commented that the voluntary sector needed to be involved earlier in the process. Dr Winfield stated that there could be better joint commissioning between the local authority and the Clinical Commissioning Group. It was important that the Voluntary Sector was involved in the Design the Neighbourhood work.
- Board members were informed that the Clinical Commissioning Group would be required to produce a Strategy in response to the Plan, by autumn. This Strategy would also align to the Berkshire West Health and Wellbeing Strategies.
- Graham Ebers stated that the trajectory around localism and integration aligned with the developing Wellbeing Strategy and the principles of 21st century Council. The local authority would work with the Clinical Commissioning Group to align its neighbourhoods with theirs and ideally they would be co-terminus.

RESOLVED: That the presentation on the NHS Long Term Plan be noted.

57. FORWARD PROGRAMME

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

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

- Councillor Hare had requested that the Learning Disability Partnership Board be invited to present to the Board's next meeting.
- It was proposed that a review of the Board's terms of reference be taken to the next meeting.
- It was noted that the JSNA summary and JSNA model forward plan would also be taken to the Board's April meeting.

RESOLVED: That the forward programme be noted.

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

**INDIVIDUAL EXECUTIVE MEMBER
 DECISION RECORD SHEET
 IMD 2019/01**

Title of the report	Surrey Heaths Draft Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance Strategy Supplementary Planning Document 2018
----------------------------	--

DECISION MADE BY Executive Member for Business, Economic Development and Strategic Planning - Stuart Munro
ACTION BY Director of Locality and Customer Services - Sarah Hollamby, Deputy Chief Executive - Graham Ebers
DECISION MADE ON 18 February 2019

Recommendation contained in the report

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

- 1) Raises a holding objection until such time as:
 - i. Clarification is provided that SANG capacity identified within Surrey Heath is reserved to mitigate housing developments within that borough, and is not available to mitigate developments elsewhere.
 - ii. Clarification is provided on what avoidance and mitigation measures will be put in place from additional car journey along roads within the 400m buffer zone of the SPA, to protect the air quality within the area.
 - iii. The map of notional SANG catchment areas included in Appendix 1 are amended to not intersect Wokingham Borough.
- 2) Support further cross boundary discussion and engagement to consider an appropriate avoidance and mitigation strategy relevant to air quality, through the Joint Strategic Partnership Board.

Decision

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

- 1) Raises a holding objection until such time as:
 - i. Clarification is provided that SANG capacity identified within Surrey Heath is reserved to mitigate housing developments within that borough, and is not available to mitigate developments elsewhere.
 - ii. Clarification is provided on what avoidance and mitigation measures will be put in place from additional car journey along roads within the 400m buffer zone of the SPA, to protect the air quality within the area.
 - iii. The map of notional SANG catchment areas included in Appendix 1 are amended to not intersect Wokingham Borough.
- 2) Support further cross boundary discussion and engagement to consider an appropriate avoidance and mitigation strategy relevant to air quality, through the Joint Strategic Partnership Board.

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 received
Leader of the Council	No comments received

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

N/A

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

None

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

None

Background papers

Please find the background documents below:

<https://consult.surreyheath.gov.uk/consult.ti/SPASPD/consultationHome>

PUBLISHED ON: 18 February 2019

EFFECTIVE ON: 26 February 2019

CALL-IN PERIOD EXPIRES: 25 February 2019

Decision made in the presence of:
 Katie Green, Specialist, Growth & Delivery
 Callum Wernham, Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist

**INDIVIDUAL EXECUTIVE MEMBER
 DECISION RECORD SHEET
 IMD 2019/03**

Title of the report	Department for Environment Food & Rural Affairs Consultation Proposals on Net Gain
----------------------------	--

DECISION MADE BY Leader of the Council (Julian McGhee-Sumner) on behalf of the Executive Member for Environment, Leisure and Libraries - John Halsall

ACTION BY Deputy Chief Executive - Graham Ebers

DECISION MADE ON 18 February 2019

Recommendation contained in the report

That the Executive Member for Environment, Leisure and Libraries agrees that Wokingham Borough Council submit the comments contained in Appendix A as this council's response to the governments consultation 'Net Gain consultation proposals, December 2018'.

Decision

That the Leader of the Council (on behalf of the Executive Member for Environment, Leisure and Libraries) agrees that Wokingham Borough Council submit the comments contained in Appendix A as this council's response to the governments consultation 'Net Gain consultation proposals, December 2018'.

Reasons for Decision if different to recommendation

The Leader of the Council signed the decision on behalf of the Executive Member for Environment, Leisure and Libraries.

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 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: 18 February 2019

EFFECTIVE ON: 26 February 2019

CALL-IN PERIOD EXPIRES: 25 February 2019

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

**INDIVIDUAL EXECUTIVE MEMBER
 DECISION RECORD SHEET
 IMD 2019/02**

Title of the report	Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead Traveller local plan: Issues and Options consultation
----------------------------	--

DECISION MADE BY Executive Member for Business, Economic Development and Strategic Planning - Stuart Munro
ACTION BY Deputy Chief Executive - Graham Ebers
DECISION MADE ON 18 February 2019

Recommendation contained in the report

That the Executive Member for Strategic Planning and Highways agrees that Wokingham Borough Council submit the comments contained in Appendix A as this council's response to the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead's consultation on the Traveller Local Plan Issues and Options consultation

Decision

That the Executive Member for Business, Economic Development and Strategic Planning agrees that Wokingham Borough Council submit the comments contained in Appendix A as this council's response to the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead's consultation on the Traveller Local Plan Issues and Options consultation.

Reasons for Decision if different to recommendation

Correction of Executive Member title: Executive Member for Business, Economic Development and Strategic Planning.

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

RBWM Traveller Local Plan: Issues and Options consultation document and supporting documents available at:

https://www3.rbwm.gov.uk/info/201041/traveller_local_plan/1404/issues_and_options_traveller_local_plan

PUBLISHED ON: 18 February 2019

EFFECTIVE ON: 26 February 2019

CALL-IN PERIOD EXPIRES: 25 February 2019

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE HELD ON 20 FEBRUARY 2019 FROM 7.00 PM TO 9.05 PM

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Philip Houldsworth (Chairman), Malcolm Richards (Vice-Chairman), Andy Croy, Guy Grandison, Kate Haines, Mike Haines, Ken Miall, Shahid Younis and Rachele Shepherd-DuBey

Other Councillors Present

Councillors: Graham Howe

Officers Present

Peter Baveystock, Lead Specialist, Place Clienting and Reactive Highway Services
Neil Carr, Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist
Louise Griffin, Performance and Programme Management Specialist
Emma Pilgrim, Specialist - Place Clienting

76. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted from Lindsay Ferris, Clive Jones, Ian Pittock and Bill Soane.

Rachele Shepherd-Dubey attended the meeting as a substitute.

77. APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIRMAN

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

RESOLVED: That Malcolm Richards be appointed as Vice-Chairman of the Committee for the remainder of the 2018/19 Municipal Year.

78. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 16 January 2019 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

79. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

80. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no public questions.

81. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

There were no Member questions.

82. GRASS CUTTING DELIVERY PLAN - SPRING 2019

The Committee considered a report, set out at Agenda pages 11 to 34, which gave details of the grass cutting delivery plan for 2019.

Councillor Graham Howe (Deputy Executive Member for Environment, Leisure and Libraries), Peter Baveystock (Service Manager, Cleaner, Greener and Reactive Highway Services), and Emma Pilgrim (Specialist – Place Clienting) attended the meeting to present the report and answer Member questions.

Nigel Payne (Regional Director) and Peter Fry (Area Manager) attended the meeting as representatives of the Council's contractor, Tivoli.

The Committee had requested the report as a follow up to its Scrutiny review of the Council's Grounds Maintenance service in 2018. The Scrutiny review had included 12 recommendations which were approved by the Executive in January 2019. The recommendations focussed on measures to ensure that the Council's contractor (Tivoli) had sufficient resources in place (staff, supervisors and machinery) to enable the grass cutting service to be delivered effectively. Appended to the report was a schedule containing Officer comments and actions relating to the 12 Scrutiny recommendations.

The report stated that an action plan had been developed with the contractor which identified key risks and mitigating actions put in place. These included:

- early recruitment and training of contractor staff;
- a focus on ensuring readiness of new and existing machinery;
- a clear two-way communications plan which enabled early warning of emerging issues;
- contingency arrangements in the event of delays in the grass cutting programme.

Members were informed that work on the action plan had commenced in January 2019 and that good progress had been made. This included staff recruitment, the procurement of new machinery and maintenance of existing machinery. Current key performance indicators (KPIs) had been reviewed and new KPIs added in order to make targets more realistic and penalties more appropriate.

The report stated that progress in delivering the action plan would be monitored during the year and would be discussed at regular review meetings between the Council's client team and Tivoli. Further update reports would be submitted to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee as the grass cutting season progressed.

During the ensuing discussion Member raised the following points:

In relation to the Risk Matrix attached to the report, what actions had been taken to address the risk relating to lack of WBC monitoring resource? It was confirmed that the Council's new Locality Services team would provide increased resilience to contractual arrangements by engaging with local stakeholders and providing feedback on emerging service issues.

How was the Council addressing the problems caused by hedge encroachments onto footpaths? It was confirmed that this was more of a street cleansing/highways issue. Specific issues would be investigated and addressed.

In relation to Winnersh Meadows, there were major problems in 2018 when the grass was up to four feet high which attracted ticks and fleas. What improvements were planned for 2019? It was confirmed that a management plan would be developed for Winnersh Meadows in consultation with the Council's biodiversity experts and local Members.

As the weather was currently very mild were plans in place to deal with early growth? It was confirmed that preparations were well advanced relating to staff

recruitment/training and maintenance of machinery. Three sub-contractors were also in place to act as a backstop.

Was the current distribution of waste bins across the Borough adequate, especially in relation to the collection of dog waste? It was confirmed that dog waste could be placed in general waste bins. There were currently around 1,000 waste bins in place across the Borough. Officers were happy to look at specific issues to determine whether local provision was adequate and effective.

What were the key lessons learned from earlier years and what were the key improvements in place for 2019? In order to illustrate the response Peter Fry gave a presentation to the Committee on the changes being introduced in 2019. These included earlier recruitment of full-time and seasonal operatives and enhanced maintenance facilities with two full-time mechanics. Tivoli were also introducing a new operating platform comprising hand-held devices which would improve productivity, reduce paperwork and strengthen health and safety procedures.

What measures were in place to improve communication about the grass cutting service to residents and Members? It was confirmed that details of the grass cutting schedules would be shared with Members. Work was ongoing to place improved information on the Council's website. In the meantime residents' queries and complaints should be submitted to the Council's Customer Service team. Information received would be fed into the Dynamics system which would enable more accurate monitoring and reporting.

What was the potential for using drones to monitor the effectiveness of the grass cutting programme? It was felt that drones may not add much value to the monitoring of grass cutting but may be useful to improve health and safety and reduce risk in relation to arboriculture work.

Members considered the most suitable time for a follow-up report once the grass cutting season was under way. It was felt that a report to the Committee's June 2019 meeting would be appropriate followed by a "lessons learned" report to the October 2019 meeting.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) Graham Howe, Peter Baveystock, Peter Fry, Nigel Payne and Emma Pilgrim be thanked for attending the meeting to update the Committee and answer Member questions;
- 2) the Officer response to the Committee's twelve Scrutiny review recommendations be noted;
- 3) the grass cutting delivery and communication plans for 2019 be welcomed and supported;
- 4) the Committee receive a further update report at its June 2019 meeting and a "lessons learned" report at its meeting in October 2019.

83. Q3 2018-19 PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT REPORT

The Committee considered a report, set out at Agenda pages 35 to 82, which gave details of the Quarter 3 2018/19 Council Plan Performance Monitoring.

Louise Griffin (Performance and Programme Management Specialist) attended the meeting to present the report and answer Member questions.

The report gave details of responses to questions posed by the Committee at its meeting in November 2018. It also provided a service narrative for the Q3 measures falling short of the specified targets (Red).

For Quarter 3 of 2018/19, 75% of the performance measures were reported as meeting the assigned targets (Green); 14% were marginally off target (Amber) and 11% were reported as Red.

The targets assigned to each indicator were SMART – specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and timely. They took into account historic trend information to assess the direction of travel and benchmarking data which showed how the Borough compared with regional or national performance.

The indicators with a Red rating were:

- EA1iii: Percentage of Wokingham borough state-funded special schools with a current Ofsted rating of Good or better;
- EA3: Percentage of early years settings in Wokingham borough with an Ofsted rating of Good or better;
- EA7: Percentage of infants who received a 6-8 week review within 8 weeks;
- EA11: 12-month rolling voluntary turnover of qualified Social Worker within Children's Social Care and Early Intervention Service;
- VP1iv: Non-elective admissions;
- VP7: Percentage of children leaving care who achieved permanence;
- VP8: Percentage of child protection visits due in the period which were completed on time (within 10 days of the previous visit);
- VP11: Percentage of formal homelessness decisions made within 45 working days.

Appended to the report was a summary of the performance measures currently supporting the Council Plan Key Actions for 2018/19 (Appendix A) and supplementary performance information for each performance measure (Appendix B).

During the ensuing discussion, Members raised the following points:

VP8: Percentage of child protection visits due in the period which were completed on time (within 10 days of the previous visit).

Members noted that this indicator had been reported as “Red” for the previous six quarters and sought clarification on the reasons given for not achieving the target. It was confirmed that the 10 day target had been set locally. The statutory target for this indicator was 42 days. Members queried whether this local target was “SMART”, i.e. achievable and asked

for an update on the implications of not meeting the target and the measures being put in place to achieve it.

EA2: Percentage of children who attend a Wokingham Borough state funded school (Primary, Secondary or Special) which is Ofsted rated Good or Outstanding.

What were the implications of the new tougher Ofsted inspection regime for the achievement of the target? How was the service responding to the new challenges? As this indicator was linked to the performance of individual schools, what was the Council's contribution towards achieving the target – in that sense, was it a SMART target? In relation to the Northern House School, what progress was being made in improving the school's performance?

EA7: Percentage of infants who received a 6-8 week review within 8 weeks.

Members noted that this indicator had also been reported as "Red" for the previous six quarters and requested further information on the measures being taken to achieve the specified target.

Council Plan Priority: Improve the customer experience when accessing Council services.

Members noted that, of the 11 underpinning performance indicators relating to this Council Plan Priority, only two appeared to relate directly to improving the customer experience:

CE9: Percentage of first contact resolution – calls and emails;

CE10: Percentage of calls answered.

Members asked for clarification on the indicators used to measure the customer experience when accessing Council services. It was confirmed that the Committee would be considering an update on the 21st Century Council programme at its March 2019 meeting. This update should include information on measures to improve customer satisfaction as this was one of the key aims of the programme. The update should also include the steps taken to monitor and report customer satisfaction levels.

Members discussed the process for deciding on key performance indicators and associated targets, including who set the targets and who was consulted about the process. It was felt that a briefing session on key indicator and target setting would be useful. It was reported that the Committee would be receiving an update on the new Borough Plan at its March 2019 meeting. This could be linked to a briefing on the setting of priorities, key indicators and targets for the new plan.

Members asked for clarification on the process for identifying the demand for new schools across the Borough, e.g. analysis of birth rates, demographic projections, number of new houses approved and built, movements in and out of the Borough, etc.

Wokingham Town Centre Market Place – Members noted the comments in the report relating to Member scrutiny of this project via the Town Centre Board. Members asked for clarification on the operation of the Town Centre Board, e.g. membership, terms of reference, frequency of meetings, decision-making powers, public accountability, consultation and communication processes with local stakeholders.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) Louise Griffin be thanked for attending the meeting to present the report and answer Member questions;
- 2) the Quarter 3 2018/19 Council Plan Performance monitoring report be noted;
- 3) responses be sought to the specific issues raised by Members during the meeting;
- 4) a briefing on the setting of key performance indicators and targets be provided at a future meeting of the Committee.

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

The Committee considered a copy of the Executive Forward Programme and Individual Executive Member Forward Programme as set out on Agenda pages 83 to 92.

During the ensuing discussion, Members raised the following points:

Cemetery Regulations – Members requested an update on the provision of burial space across the Borough.

Parking Strategy – it was confirmed that an update would be submitted to the Community and Corporate Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting in March 2019.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) the Executive and Individual Executive Member Decision Forward Programmes be noted;
- 2) the items raised by Members be considered as part of the development of Overview and Scrutiny work programmes for 2019/20.

85. COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMMES

The Committee considered its forward work programme and that of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees as set out on Agenda pages 93 to 98.

Members noted that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee work programmes for 2019/20 would be considered at the Committee's meeting on 20 March 2019.

The Chairman highlighted a potential Scrutiny item for 2019/20 relating to the development of 55 apartments at the Carnival Pool regeneration site.

Ken Miall confirmed that the Children's Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee scheduled for 19 February had been moved to 25 March 2019.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) the Overview and Scrutiny work programmes for 2108/19 be noted;
- 2) the development of 55 apartments at the Carnival Pool site be added to the list of potential work programme items for 2019/20;

3) Members submit any potential Scrutiny items for 2019/20 to Neil Carr in Democratic Services.

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

The Chairman invited members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees to provide an update on the issues considered at recent meetings.

RESOLVED: That the updates from the Overview and Scrutiny Committees be noted.

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF
THE EXECUTIVE
HELD ON 21 FEBRUARY 2019 FROM 7.00 PM TO 7.25 PM**

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Julian McGhee-Sumner (Chairman), Pauline Jorgensen, Stuart Munro, Pauline Helliar-Symons, John Halsall, Anthony Pollock, Parry Batth, Simon Weeks and Philip Mirfin

Other Councillors Present

Keith Baker
Gary Cowan
Richard Dolinski
Philip Houldsworth
Norman Jorgensen
Abdul Loyes
Malcolm Richards
Angus Ross
Imogen Shepherd-DuBey
Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey
Shahid Younis

96. APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence received.

97. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Executive held on 31 January 2019 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Leader of Council.

98. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest received.

99. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

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

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

Question

The residents on Outfield Crescent are complaining that commuters parking at the entrances at either end of the Crescent are creating a hazard for other road users and pedestrians, particularly children, and could potentially block emergency vehicles. This hazard could be eliminated if the double yellow lines were extended further down the road. What steps do residents need to take to get this to happen?

Answer

The issues with commuters parking on the Crescent, as far as illegal parking is concerned, is a matter for the Police. So if you find that they are parking dangerously or parking on corners or anything like that you should report it to the Police. Hazardous parking is definitely a Police matter.

Outfield Crescent itself is an unadopted road and we do not have legal authority to introduce waiting and loading restrictions on it. Despite that, as I said, it is an offence and you should report it to the Police as an obstruction.

Supplementary Question

In that case what action do I need to take or who do I need to take that to, to get action taken?

Supplementary Answer

You need to report it to the Police obviously as it is not an adopted road. We cannot put parking restrictions on it.

99.2 Christopher Neale asked the Executive Member for Planning and Enforcement the following question:

Question

The Council has stated that it seeks to protect the integrity of the Green Belt. However, it is clear from the Judgment of HHJ Angela Morris, that has been upheld by the Court of Appeal (Criminal Division), that the Council has not acted with integrity towards Mr Scott and others. The Council has been adjudged to have acted in a way that was, "unjust and unfair and so offends the court's sense of justice that it must stay the proceedings...to protect the integrity of the criminal justice system (para.93)". It is hard to think of a more serious finding that the Court could have found. Why then, and as reported in the local press, has the Council dismissed out of hand the matter of an internal investigation into the conduct of the relevant Councillors and Officers whose actions gave rise to these findings? I therefore formally request that the Council must reconsider its position - if it is not prepared to do so then please justify fully why it is so dismissive of these findings, as Council Tax payers and people having dealings with the Council, particularly in respect of planning issues, need to be confident that they will be treated in a fair and just way in accordance with the rules of natural justice.

Answer

Wokingham Borough Council is in no way dismissive of the findings or of residents' concerns over this issue. When the Leader of the Opposition asked about this at the last Executive meeting on 31 January I expressly stated that he had raised a valid point and suggested we meet the Head of Planning in order to discuss what lessons could be learnt from these events and I am pleased to say that I have had confirmation of a date back from the Leader of the Opposition. In your question you quote two lines of a very lengthy judgement. I will quote one line from the same judgement: "Other judges may have decided this case differently". Indeed they have done so in several previous cases where the Council has taken similar action against repeated breaches of planning and where the courts have always supported our approach and found in our favour.

I maintain that it is vital that we vigorously protect the Green Belt against unlawful development whilst securing the integrity of the planning process. But am very keen to learn what, if anything, we could have done differently in this case.

However, focussing on court processes misses the point that Wokingham Borough Council has successfully protected the Green Belt from unlawful development and upheld the planning process.

Finally I would remind you that despite the Court of Appeal's judgement both the High Court injunction and the two year suspended prison sentence remain in force.

Supplementary Question

I am grateful to hear that you are prepared to take this item forward with the Head of Planning and that is to be welcomed. I do, however, take issue with the statement that it might well have been considered differently by other courts. The reason being that in this instance the Council has been woefully found to be short in terms of complying with the requirements of the law of this country and therefore the Court of Appeal had no difficulty in upholding the decision of Her Honour Angela Morris and that is the important issue here. It is reputational for Wokingham Borough Council and I would submit that it would be in your interest, as much as those of myself as a council tax payer and other residents and the business world at large, for this matter to be fully addressed and then a line drawn under it so that people will have confidence going forward that the Council is acting as Caesar's wife beyond approach. Therefore I would ask you to please reconsider that aspect of your comment?

Supplementary Answer

You may have misunderstood the quote. The quote that "other judges may have decided the case differently" was that pronounced by the Court of Appeal.

Mr Neale clarified that the quote was in the finding of Her Honour Judge Morris but it had been upheld by the Court of Appeal who found nothing wrong with Her Honour's judgement.

Councillor Weeks responded as follows:

I do not disagree that was what the Court said but just to clarify I have already explained that we are having a meeting with the Leader of the Opposition to review it and I would suggest it would be appropriate that we wait until the outcome of those discussions and any conclusion we come from that to see whether it would be appropriate to take it any further.

100. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

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

100.1 Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey asked the Executive Member for Highways and Transport the following question:

Question

When will the Winnersh Relief Road Part 2 construction begin and when is it scheduled to be completed?

Answer

The planning permission for Winnersh Relief Road Phase 2, which is the B3030 King Street Lane to A329 Reading Road, was granted in October 2018. Enabling works including vegetation and tree clearance has started and this is due to complete by the end of this month. The main construction is due to start during Autumn 2019 and is programmed to be completed by Summer 2020.

Supplementary Question

Can we actually finish the Winnersh Relief Road part first before starting on the NWDR roundabout? The reason for that is the NWDR will not actually have any road attached to

the roundabout until the road is built for a while. So if we could at least do the Winnersh Relief Road part first the residents can use it in the meantime and then build the NWDR roundabout?

Supplementary Answer

I will take that back to the Officers and see if that is possible.

100.2 Gary Cowan asked the Executive Member for Finance, HR and Corporate Resources the following question:

Question

Agenda page 135 bullet point 3 refers to the ability for residents to track the progress of their issue as it is resolved by the Council. How will this work in practice?

Answer

Through the introduction of new technology customers can now report issues or request services online and depending on the type of service they will be able to track progress of their case.

For example, a resident can submit their planning application online using the National Planning Portal. Once we have validated their application they will receive an acknowledgement email with a reference number. This reference number allows the resident to view their planning application via our online Planning Register, where they can track the progress of their case. As their application progresses the status will automatically update on this page until a decision is published.

Also, as part of the new Highways technology, residents will be able to visit our website and report a defect or request for service. The resident can request to receive an update on progress when reporting the issue, they will receive a reference number and a “click here” web link that will route them back to the enquiry on the website, where they can review the activity on their case.

An additional benefit is that residents will be able to upload photos of defects and pinpoint the exact location on a map. If the defect has already been reported, instead of expecting residents to duplicate the report to get feedback, they can subscribe to the “ongoing case” and the resident will be able to track progress through the website.

This is a significant improvement to the quality of our services to our residents.

Supplementary Question

I welcome that answer and it is very, very, helpful and I would add that my question should not be taken as a criticism of what goes on in this Council. The bottom line is that Century 21 is doing a very good job and is going the right way but the relationship between individual residents and the Council is, I think, being lost in the process. I did ask a question before about the availability of a telephone directory to Members perhaps even on the website. Could I suggest that as a matter of urgency this issue should be passed to Scrutiny to look at? I could have enlarged much more on this if you had wanted me to but obviously not.

Supplementary Answer

Because this is really part of 21st Century Council and the ongoing review of that, I think it will be included in the review of the progress of 21st Century Council as Scrutiny

scrutinises that programme. I do not think I would want to send it back specifically but I think it needs to be included in what is already being done.

In response to Gary Cowan's query about whether a telephone directory of Council Officers could be provided for members of the public Councillor Pollock responded as follows:

I think you are being disingenuous. One of the points of 21st Century Council is that there are people at the end of a telephone to answer residents' queries and that we try and protect specialists so that they can get on with their specialist roles. We have more people who can answer more of the questions of residents so there is nothing in 21st Century Council that seeks to disenfranchise anyone who is unable to use the new technology and we are thoroughly committed to ensuring that all of our residents are able to access our services. So I think you misunderstand there. I think the question around the technology and the question around how it works in practice, how people who cannot use it, is the role of Scrutiny as they scrutinise the 21st Century programme.

100.3 Imogen Shepherd-DuBey asked the Executive Member for Health and Wellbeing, Adult Social Care and Housing the following question:

Question

Many of the rental garages in the Wokingham Borough Council area are in a very poor state. Often with warped woodwork, leaking roofs and peeling paint. In Agenda item 99, it is stated that the garage rents will be going up by 3.70%. Could you please reassure that this money is being spent on maintenance of these garages and not other projects?

Answer

Yes I can confirm that any additional income will go to the Housing Revenue Account that is used to manage and maintain those garages.

As you rightly point out many garages are in a very poor condition, approximately 139 are unlettable due to their condition.

In the next financial year the Housing Team have earmarked £100,000 to continue the ongoing work to either refurbish those garages where it is viable to do so, or demolish those garage blocks that are beyond economical repair.

Where there have been demolitions in the past some of the sites have been developed for much needed affordable housing and those that have not been developed have been converted to open parking. Where this has occurred, it has been well received by the tenants, the residents and Ward Members.

Supplementary Question

It is good to hear and I am hoping that these garages will get a coat of paint. Will there be a plan of action for all of these garages?

Supplementary Answer

I would suspect that there would be a plan and I can confirm that.

101. HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT BUDGET 2019/20

The Executive considered a report setting out the proposed Housing Revenue Account Budget for 2019/20.

When introducing the report the Executive Member for Health and Wellbeing explained that the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) was a ring fenced account which meant that it must be self-financing and expenditure must be paid for by the tenants through rent and service charges. In addition HRA expenditure could not be funded by council tax and similarly HRA income should not be used to pay for general fund services.

Following a query by Councillor Weeks Councillor Bath confirmed that in accordance with the Government's previous requirement, which was introduced in 2015, the Council had been obliged to reduce council house rents by 1% over the last three years however this was the final year that the Council had to do so.

RESOLVED that Council be recommended to approve:

- 1) the Housing Revenue Account budget;
- 2) Council house dwelling rents be reduced by 1% effective from April 2019 in line with the Welfare Reform and Work Act 2015;
- 3) garage rents be increased by 3.70% effective from April 2019 in line with Council fees and charge;
- 4) Shared Equity Rents will be increased by 3.27% based on September RPI, effective from April 2019;
- 5) Tenant Service Charges are set in line with estimated costs.
- 6) the Housing Major Repairs (capital) programme for 2019/20 as set out in Appendix C.
- 7) Sheltered room guest charges increase from £9.00 per night to £9.50 per night.

102. CAPITAL PROGRAMME AND STRATEGY 2019/22

The Executive considered a report setting out the proposed Capital Programme and Strategy for 2019/22.

The Executive Member for Finance went through the report and advised Members that there was one correction on page 44 of the agenda in that the Council planned to make capital investment of £486 million over the next three years and not "£484 million over the next 10 years" as stated in the covering report.

Councillor Pollock commented that although the Capital Programme was ambitious it was one he believed was affordable, prudent and sustainable and highlighted a number of areas where improvements would be made to services provided to residents.

RESOLVED that Council be recommended to:

- 1) approve the Capital strategy for 2019/22 - Appendix A;
- 2) approve the 3 year capital programme 2019/22 – Appendix B;
- 3) note the draft vision for capital investment over the next 10 years - Appendix C;

- 4) approve the developer contributions S106 and CIL as set out in Appendix D. The S106 and CIL values are estimated and approval is sought up to the scheme budget;
- 5) note the commercial activities of the Council – Appendix E.

103. TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY 2019/22

The Executive considered a report setting out the proposed Treasury Management Strategy for 2019/20-2021/22.

The Executive Member for Finance introduced the report and advised the meeting that the Strategy formed part of the Council's affordability and sustainability calculations because it linked through to the Capital Programme and demonstrated how the projects would be funded. It also showed that the Programme was being funded on a safe and sustainable basis. In addition the Strategy sets out the Council's investments and Councillor Pollock explained that because money was often received in advance of projects due to be undertaken this money was used efficiently and effectively. He further reported that the Council continued to take a cautious approach to investments and all investments were linked to UK assets.

RESOLVED that Council be recommended to approve the following:

- 1) Capital Prudential indicators, 2019/20;
- 2) Borrowing strategy 2019/20;
- 3) Annual Investment Strategy 2019/20;
- 4) Flexible use of capital receipts strategy;
- 5) MRP policy; and
- 6) Treasury indicators: limits to borrowing activity 2019/20.

104. MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN 2019/22 REVENUE BUDGET SUBMISSION 2019/20

The Executive considered a report setting out a proposed Medium Term Financial Plan for 2019/22 and the Revenue Budget Submission for 2019/20.

The Leader of Council informed the meeting that since the publication of the agenda two amendments to the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) had been received: the precept for the Police and Crime Commissioner for the Thames Valley had now been confirmed as £14,476,050 rather than the provisional figure of £14,476,029; and the total 2019/20 precept for Winnersh Parish Council had also now been confirmed as £137,314 rather than the provisional figure of £137,325 as set out in the MTFP papers.

The Executive Member for Finance highlighted a number of areas in the MTFP document including the Summary of Budget Movements table for 2019/20, as set out on page 129 of the agenda, which documented changes to various budget lines and also showed the investments and savings that were being made in Council services.

Councillor Pollock also reiterated that the Council did not receive any Revenue Support Grant from the Government and was almost wholly financed by council tax. He felt that the fact that the Council was not cutting services and was in fact investing in and improving services was a great credit to the work of Members and Officers.

RESOLVED that:

- 1) Council be recommended to approve the Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) 2019/22, including the budget submission for 2019/20 and the changes put forward at the meeting;
- 2) the amended schedule of fees and charges as set out in Appendix B to the report, to be effective from the dates listed on the schedule, be approved.

105. 21ST CENTURY COUNCIL - UPDATE

The Executive considered a report which provided an update of the 21st Century Council Programme.

Members were informed by the Executive Member for Finance that the Programme was very important to the Council as it would ensure that service delivery was brought into the 21st Century eg by improving the availability of, and access to, Council services through digital channels. In addition it was noted that in relation to the Programme's £4m savings target it was expected that at the end of financial year 2019/20 the Programme would have secured £3m per annum worth of savings. The further £1m savings outstanding, related to Peoples' Services, would be dealt with as part of a wider set of efficiency and growth plans within the Medium Term Financial Plan and was expected to be delivered in the next 12 months through the work of the Adults' and Children's Improvement Boards.

RESOLVED: That the progress in implementing the 21st Century Council programme and the fact that future updates will be reported as part of the ongoing Revenue Monitoring Executive reports, as part of a broader Council wide continuous improvement programme be noted.

106. STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

The Executive considered a report relating to a proposed Statement of Community Involvement document which sets out how consultation will take place with the community on planning policy documents and planning applications.

Members were informed by the Executive Member for Planning and Enforcement that the Council was required to review and update it's Statement of Community Involvement document in order to keep it up to date and aligned with current thinking and guidance from the Government.

RESOLVED that:

- 1) the Statement of Community Involvement 2019 be adopted for use in consultation on planning matters;
- 2) the supporting Consultation Statement and Adoption Statement are noted and published on the Council's website.

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
STANDARDS COMMITTEE
HELD ON 4 MARCH 2019 FROM 7.00 PM TO 7.20 PM**

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Ken Miall (Chairman), UllaKarin Clark, Dianne King and Imogen Shepherd-DuBey

Parish/Town Council Representatives: Roy Mantel (Co-Optee Twyford Parish Council)

Officers Present

Andrew Moulton, Assistant Director, Governance and Monitoring Officer

Neil Carr, Democratic and Electoral Services Specialist

24. APOLOGIES

No apologies for absence were received.

25. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 7 January 2019 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

26. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

27. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no public questions.

28. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

There were no Member questions.

29. PARISH / TOWN COUNCIL QUESTION TIME

There were no Parish or Town Council questions.

30. UPDATE ON COMPLAINTS AND FEEDBACK

The Committee considered a report, set out at Agenda pages 7 to 11, which gave details of progress relating to ongoing Code of Conduct complaints.

The report stated that, since the previous meeting in January 2019, two Code of Conduct complaints had been resolved. Two new complaints had also been received following the despatch of the Agenda. These new complaints were currently being considered by the Chairman, Independent Person and Monitoring Officer.

Andrew Moulton, Monitoring Officer, updated the Committee on the two resolved complaints. The first complaint related to conduct and behaviour at a public meeting and actions surrounding support for a resident. The second complaint related to conduct and behaviour at the same public meeting. Following an investigation into the complaints it had been concluded that there was no breach of the Code of Conduct and, therefore, no further action was taken.

Members queried the length of time taken to resolve the two complaints set out in the report. Andrew Moulton explained that the delay had resulted from the absence of the

investigating officer due to ill health. This was an unfortunate set of circumstances and all the other complaints had been resolved within a reasonable period.

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

31. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS IN PUBLIC LIFE

The Committee considered a report, set out on Agenda pages 13 to 124, which included the report of the Committee on Standards in Public Life (CSPL) on Local Government Ethical Standards.

The report stated that, at its meeting in March 2018, the Standards Committee had considered a consultation exercise being undertaken by the CSPL. Following the consultation exercise the CSPL had published its report in January 2019.

The CSPL report concluded that the vast majority of local government Members and Officers maintained the highest standards of conduct. However, there were continuing examples of misconduct such as bullying, harassment and other disruptive behaviours. The CSPL had also identified risks around conflicts of interest, gifts and hospitality and expressed concerns about the increasing complexity of decision making which placed governance procedures under increasing strain.

The CSPL felt that the benefits of the current devolved arrangements should be retained, but that more robust safeguards should be introduced to strengthen locally determined systems. The report made a number of recommendations including:

- development of an updated model Code of Conduct by the Local Government Association;
- candidates standing for public office should not be required publicly to disclose their home address;
- Councillors should be presumed to be acting in an official capacity in their public conduct, including statements on social media;
- the Disclosable Pecuniary Interests Regulations should be amended to include unpaid directorships, trusteeships, management roles in a charity and membership of any organisations seeking to influence public opinion or public policy;
- Councillors should not participate in a discussion or vote in a matter if they have an interest if a member of the public would reasonably regard the interest as so significant that it would be likely to prejudice their consideration or decision making;
- Independent Persons should be appointed for a fixed term of two years, renewable once;
- Councils should be given the power to suspend Councillors, without allowances, for up to six months;
- Councillors should be given the right of appeal to the Local Government Ombudsman if their Council imposes a period of suspension;

- Parish Council Clerks should hold an appropriate qualification, such as those provided by the Society of Local Council Clerks.

The CSPL report stated that a number of its recommendations would involve legislative change. In the meantime, its list of “best practice” actions provided a benchmark for ethical practice which it expected all Councils to implement.

In the ensuing discussion, Members discussed the potential impact of the proposal relating to the potential suspension of Members for up to six months. What were the implications of suspension for a Member’s work in supporting residents? Andrew Moulton stated that this would be one of the issues to be considered as part of the Government’s response to the CSPL report.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) the CSPL report on Ethical Standards in Local Government be noted;
- 2) the Committee receive a report to its next meeting with an assessment of the Council’s current Standards arrangements compared with the CSPL list of Best Practice.

32. STANDARDS COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT

The Committee considered its draft Annual Report, set out on Agenda pages 125 to 132. The report provided a summary of the Committee’s activities during 2018/19 and described how it continued to promote the highest standards of conduct by elected Members representing the Borough, Town and Parish Councils. In so doing it sought to ensure compliance with the Nolan principles of public life: selflessness, integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness, honesty and leadership.

The report stated that, during the 2018/19 Municipal Year, six Code of Conduct complaints had been received and that, following investigation, none of the complaints resulted in informal or formal sanctions. The conclusions in each case were supported by the Chairman, Independent Person and Monitoring Officer.

Andrew Moulton confirmed that two additional complaints had been received following the despatch of the Agenda. These new complaints were currently under investigation.

Members noted that the number of Code of Conduct complaints received should be seen in the context of there being 54 Borough Council Members and over 200 Members of Town and Parish Councils across the Borough.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) the Standards Committee Annual Report 2018/19 be approved;
- 2) the Annual Report be submitted to the Council at its meeting on 21 March 2019.

This page is intentionally left blank

Decision made in the presence of:
 Robert Curtis, Transport Planning Team Manager
 Callum Wernham, Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist
 Councillor David Sleight

INDIVIDUAL EXECUTIVE MEMBER DECISION RECORD SHEET IMD 2019/04
--

Title of the report	Heathrow Airspace Consultation Response
----------------------------	--

DECISION MADE BY .Leader of the Council - Julian McGhee-Sumner
ACTION BY Director of Locality and Customer Services - Sarah Hollamby
DECISION MADE ON 05 March 2019

Recommendation contained in the report

That the Leader of the Council (on behalf of the Executive Member for Highways and Transport):

- 1) Notes the contents of the report on Heathrow Airspace and Future operations consultation;
- 2) Approves the response to the HAL (Heathrow Airport Limited) consultation as detailed in this report (appendix A) and;
- 3) Authorises officers to return the response to HAL on behalf of Wokingham Borough Council.

Decision

That the Leader of the Council (on behalf of the Executive Member for Highways and Transport):

- 1) Noted the contents of the report on Heathrow Airspace and Future operations consultation;
- 2) Approved the response to the HAL (Heathrow Airport Limited) consultation as detailed in this report (appendix A) and;
- 3) Authorised Officers to return the response to HAL on behalf of Wokingham Borough Council.

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 comment received
Monitoring Officer	No comment
Leader of the Council	No comment

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

Background to the consultation and proposed response to the consultation.

PUBLISHED ON: 5 March 2019

EFFECTIVE ON: 13 March 2019

CALL-IN PERIOD EXPIRES: 12 March 2019

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE HELD ON 6 MARCH 2019 FROM 7.00 PM TO 8.20 PM

Committee Members Present

Councillors: Kate Haines (Vice-Chairman, in the Chair), Jenny Cheng, Andy Croy, John Jarvis, Abdul Loyes, Ken Miall, Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey, Mike Haines (substituting Bill Soane) and Ian Pittock (substituting Clive Jones)

Others Present

Malcolm Richards

Jim Stockley, Healthwatch Wokingham Borough

Madeleine Shopland, Democratic & Electoral Services Specialist

Rhosyn Harris, Public Health

Angela Morris, Director Adult Services

Helen Woodland, Assistant Director Provider Services, Optalis

Rebecca Clegg, Chief Finance Officer, NHS Berkshire West Clinical Commissioning Group

39. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted from Councillors Clive Jones and Bill Soane.

40. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 21 January 2019 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

41. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

42. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no public questions.

43. MEMBER QUESTION TIME

There were no Member questions.

44. PREPARING FOR BREXIT - HEALTH

Rhosyn Harris, Public Health and Rebecca Clegg, Chief Finance Officer, NHS Berkshire West Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG), provided an update on preparing for Brexit – health.

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

- Rhosyn Harris reminded Members that with regards to local authorities it was government policy that specific plans for a possible no deal situation were not shared publicly.
- Under the Civil Contingency Act 2004 local authorities were Category 1 responders and as such they were required to assess the risk of emergencies occurring and use this to inform contingency planning, put in place emergency plans and to put in place business continuity management arrangements.
- Nationally there was approximately 1.6million jobs in the social care sector, the majority of which were with independent providers. Approximately 7% were with local authorities. Nationally, approximately 104,000 social care posts were held by EU

nationals and 71% of these either held British citizenship or were eligible for settled status. Members were informed that the estimated proportion of the adult social care workforce with an EU nationality had not seen a big decrease.

- In the South East there were 3,450 organisations providing care at over 6,900 locations and 181,000 full time equivalent (FTE) jobs of which 12% of post holders were EU Nationals. In the Borough there was 3,700 full time equivalent social care jobs; 3% of these were within the local authority, 89% were in the independent sector and 8% were direct payment recipients. 444 posts (12%) were held by EU Nationals.
- Members were advised that overall it was considered that there was a low risk of disruption to local social care delivery in the short term.
- Mitigations included the EU Settlement Scheme and wider work to address recruitment and retention of the Adult Social Care workforce.
- Rebecca Clegg indicated that she was the nominated lead for Brexit for the CCG. The NHS had been asked to prepare in the context of the possibility of a no deal situation. Preparations could be adapted should other outcomes occur.
- The Committee was informed that the NHS was used to managing risk and system pressures and that Emergency Preparedness, Resilience and Response (EPRR) processes and procedures were in place. Existing command and control protocols and systems that were familiar for information-gathering, assurance, direction and advice, would be used. Additional capacity would be added at both regional and national levels.
- It was noted that NHS Berkshire West CCG was a Category 2 responder (a supporting agency).
- The Department of Health and Social Care had issued EU Exit Operational Guidance in December 2018, which outlined what actions providers and commissioners of health and social care services should take to prepare for, and manage, the risks of a no deal exit scenario. Rebecca Clegg highlighted what action the CCG was required to take including preparing business continuity plans for a no deal EU exit, by the end of January 2019; and carrying out a no deal EU exit exercise to test business continuity plans by the end of February 2019. Members were informed that the business continuity plans of 14 practices had been tested and that a report of findings would be shared with all practices in the area.
- The NHS had been asked to prepare specifically in seven key areas:
 - Supply of medicines and vaccines;
 - Supply of medical devices and clinical consumables;
 - Supply of non-clinical consumables, goods and services;
 - Workforce;
 - Reciprocal healthcare;
 - Research and clinical trials; and
 - Data sharing, processing and access
- Ensuring continuity of medical devices and clinical consumables was discussed. Measures that would be taken included a centralised stock build; preparing suppliers; prioritisation of medical products; dedicated supply channels for products that had a supply centre located within the EU; additional warehouse capacity and the provision of advice to NHS providers.
- With regards to medicines, Rebecca Clegg highlighted issues under consideration including the undertaking of a medicine supply assessment, considering alternative transport routes; vaccine stocks; clinical research including trials; unlicensed medicines and a serious shortage protocol. In addition the Government had advised to have six weeks additional supplies of medicines to avoid disruption potentially caused by a possible no deal EU exit.

- With regards to data, guidance had been issued on the actions that organisations needed to take in order to ensure continuity of access to, processing and sharing of personal data. An early review of data flows and contracts to understand what data was sent and received from overseas, had been undertaken.
- With regards to workforce, the overall assessment was that there was a low risk of disruption to local service delivery in the short term.
- Councillor Miall commented that many paramedics, volunteer drivers and delivery drivers may currently be driving in the UK using EU drivers licences and that should there be a no deal EU exit these may no longer be accepted. He questioned whether consideration had been given to this and whether these drivers would be required to gain UK drivers licences. Rebecca Clegg indicated that she would follow this up with South Central Ambulance Service.
- Councillor Miall went on to ask about the preparedness of private companies. Rebecca Clegg indicated that all providers were required to have business continuity plans in place.
- Councillor Loyes questioned whether 6 weeks additional supply of medicines would be sufficient and was informed that this was what had been recommended by central Government.
- Councillor Shepherd-DuBey commented that if there was a £30,000 salary threshold for skilled workers moving to the UK there would be a detrimental effect on the social care sector. She commented that the number of staff coming from the EU was reducing and questioned how they would be replaced. Rhosyn Harris commented recruitment was an issue locally due to the high cost of living in the area.
- Councillor Richards asked about the supply and transportation of medicine.
- Councillor Croy stated that he believed that workforce should be considered a greater risk than 'low' and asked that this be fed back. Recruitment and retention was already an issue locally.
- Councillor Croy went on to ask about a potential shortage of radioisotopes in the event of a no deal EU exit.
- In response to questions from Councillor Mike Haines, Rebecca Clegg indicated that the CCG's data was based in the UK. Greater awareness was sought in relation to cloud based storage.
- Councillor Mike Haines also asked whether staff qualifications would still be recognised in the EU and vice versa.

RESOLVED: That

- 1) the update on preparing for Brexit – health be noted.
- 2) Rhosyn Harris and Rebecca Clegg be thanked for their presentation.

45. WOKINGHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL AND OPTALIS RESPONSE TO A RECENT HEALTHWATCH REPORT

At the previous Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting Members had viewed a video interview between Healthwatch Wokingham Borough and a member of the public regarding their experience with the START team. Angela Morris, Director Adult Services and Helen Woodland, Assistant Director Provider Services, Optalis provided an update on the case. Officers had met with the family.

Angela Morris explained the assessment process. In the first instance a social worker undertook an assessment of the customer's needs. In the particular case a referral had been made to the START team and an assessment made on how a particular identified

need could be met. Helen Woodland indicated that the role of Optalis was to help the customer to become more independent.

RESOLVED: That

- 1) the update be noted.
- 2) Angela Morris and Helen Woodland be thanked for their update.

46. IMPACT OF FUNDING CUT ON HEALTHWATCH WOKINGHAM

The Committee received a report regarding the impact of funding cuts on Healthwatch Wokingham Borough.

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

- Jim Stockley commented that the report had been prepared in response to questions from the Committee regarding the impact of a cut in the Healthwatch budget.
- Healthwatch Wokingham Borough had been established in April 2013 as a Community Interest Company to deliver the Healthwatch remit. At that time the budget had been £107,000. The budget had remained the same until competitive rebidding of contract in September 2018, when this was reduced to £98,000, although the true budget was less once inflation was factored in. It was acknowledged that the Council had maintained the funding for a number of years and not reduced it until the 2019 Financial Year.
- Much of Healthwatch Wokingham's Borough's costs were operational.
- It was noted that there was no longer a volunteer co-ordinator.
- Angela Morris commented that officers valued the service provided by Healthwatch Wokingham Borough and the contribution that they made. She highlighted the national picture for the funding of Healthwatches.
- In 2018 in Wokingham Borough, funding had been reduced by approximately 7%. The new contract had been advertised at £100,000 and Healthwatch Wokingham Borough had bid £98,000. The tender bid had been assessed at that price. Councillor Miall asked how it had been decided that the contract would be £100,000.
- Contract review meetings between Healthwatch Wokingham Borough and Officers were held every 3 months.
- Councillor Richards asked what Healthwatch Wokingham Borough could not provide following the reduction in its funding. Jim Stockley confirmed that Healthwatch Wokingham Borough were able to meet the contract but were now less able to undertake specific additional projects on matters of concern to residents.
- Members questioned whether additional funding could be identified to fund Healthwatch Wokingham Borough to undertake specific projects in the public interest, if required. Officers agreed to follow this up.
- Councillor Croy thanked Healthwatch Wokingham Borough for the work it and its volunteers carried out. He expressed concern that historically inflation had not been applied to the contract.
- In response to a question from Councillor Croy regarding the impact of focusing only on adult mental health as a priority, Angela Morris commented that there was no expectation for Healthwatch Wokingham Borough to deliver over the contract.
- The Committee was invited to an event on 25 March at Wokingham Town Hall 6.30pm at which groups would be presenting on small projects funded by Healthwatch Wokingham Borough to further engagement with hard to reach groups.

- Councillor Kate Haines emphasised that the Committee wanted to see the continuation of conversations between Officers and Healthwatch Wokingham Borough.

RESOLVED: That

- 1) the report on the impact of funding cuts on Healthwatch Wokingham Borough be noted;
- 2) Healthwatch Wokingham Borough be thanked for their report.

This page is intentionally left blank