



**WOKINGHAM  
BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**MINUTES OF COMMITTEE MEETINGS  
FOR THE PERIOD**

**27 July 2015 to 19 August 2015**

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

Andy Couldrick  
Chief Executive  
Published on 9 September 2015

## **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**

	<b>PAGE NO.</b>
Monday, 27 July 2015 of Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee	<b>5 - 10</b>
Tuesday, 28 July 2015 of Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee	<b>11 - 16</b>
Wednesday, 29 July 2015 of Standards Committee	<b>17 - 20</b>
Thursday, 30 July 2015 of Executive	<b>21 - 24</b>
Thursday, 30 July 2015 of Executive	<b>25 - 40</b>
Decisions , 10/08/2015 Executive - Individual Member Decisions	<b>41 - 42</b>
Decisions , 10/08/2015 Executive - Individual Member Decisions	<b>43 - 44</b>
Decisions , 11/08/2015 Executive - Individual Member Decisions	<b>45 - 46</b>
Decisions , 11/08/2015 Executive - Individual Member Decisions	<b>47 - 48</b>
Thursday, 13 August 2015 of Health and Wellbeing Board	<b>49 - 58</b>
Wednesday, 19 August 2015 of Planning Committee	<b>59 - 64</b>

**This page is intentionally left blank**

## MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE HELD ON 27 JULY 2015 FROM 7.30 PM TO 8.50 PM

### **Committee Members Present**

Councillors: Tim Holton (Chairman), Michael Firmager (Vice-Chairman), Lindsay Ferris, Pauline Helliar-Symons, John Jarvis, Norman Jorgensen, Ken Miall, Malcolm Richards and Shahid Younis

### **Officers Present**

Kevin Jacob, Principal Democratic Services Officer  
Julie Holland, Service Manager, Business Improvement

### **9. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were submitted from Prue Bray, (substituted by Lindsay Ferris) and UllaKarin Clark.

### **10. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 1 June 2015 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### **11. DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interests.

### **12. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

There were no public questions.

### **13. MEMBER QUESTION TIME**

There were no Member questions.

### **14. BALANCED SCORECARD 2014/2015 QUARTER 4**

The Committee considered a report a report on Agenda pages 17 to 26 which set out details of the Council's performance as measured by a series of performance indicators for Quarter 4 of the 2014/2015 financial year. It was confirmed that this was last time the Balanced Scorecard report would be presented in the current format prior to the redesigned scorecard coming into effect.

Julie Holland, Service Manager Business Improvement presented the report and highlighted that out of a total of 64 performance indicators, 50 or 75% had a 'green' status and were meeting the agreed target, 9 were 'amber' and 5 had a 'red' status and were below target. Members were reminded that each indicator had a commentary which gave more context and if a target was not being achieved, the corrective action being taken to improve performance.

The Committee then discussed the Quarter 4 report and a summary of the points raised during the discussion is set out below:

- With reference to Indicator 2 – Turnover of Staff, a number of Members of the questioned how the target of 10-15% had been arrived at and some concerns were expressed that even 10% represented a relatively high rate of staff turnover;
- A general observation was made that the Committee should consider increasing the level of challenge in its consideration of the appropriateness of particular targets and

whether they had been set at too low or too high level. It was also felt that it would be helpful for the Committee to have a clear idea of how the targets had been agreed including the involvement in that process by the relevant Executive Member;

- With regard to Indicator 8 – Looked After Children who have three or more placements within the year it was noted that press coverage indicated that such children often had to cope with the additional disruption of changing schools. Nationally Looked After Children tended to perform less well academically and Members were concerned that appropriate measures were in place locally to support them;
- Members referred to the changes the Government had made to Housing Benefit and questioned whether there was any data to suggest whether this national policy change had impacted on the number of households becoming homeless;
- The high rates of Council Tax collection by the Council were noted and it was felt that this was a significant achievement worth recognising;
- With regard to Indicator 59 - the number of dwellings permitted which were considered to be countable within the 5 year land supply, Members sought reassurance that sufficient homes would be delivered to meet the land supply targets;

Julie Holland agreed to look into the areas raised by the Committee including the process by which targets had been agreed. The Committee was reminded that the revised Balanced Scorecard report was significantly shorter and different in presentation than the previous model and contained stronger links to the Council's priorities.

The Chairman commented that as part of the Committee's role to hold Executive Members to account, Executive Members would in due course be invited to attend future meetings of the Committee. This would 1) allow the Committee to ask them questions relating to the performance and operation of Council services within their portfolios including performance as reported via the Balanced Scorecard and 2) provide an opportunity for the Executive Member to highlight and share issue relating to their service area priorities.

Kevin Jacob commented that it was anticipated that the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee would if it felt appropriate, invite the Executive Member for Health and Wellbeing to attend its meetings and that the Children's Services Overview and Scrutiny could also invite the Executive Member for Children's Services to attend its meetings.

After discussion, it was agreed that a final decision on the scheduling of the invitations to attend the Committee should be made in light of any areas of concern or interest highlighted within the 2015/2016 Quarter 1 Balanced Scorecard.

**RESOLVED:**

- 1) That the 2014/2015 Quarter 4 scorecard of performance indicators be noted;
- 2) That further information in respect of the questions and issues raised by the Committee be circulated to Members outside of the meeting.

**15. CONSIDERATION OF THE CURRENT EXECUTIVE FORWARD PROGRAMME**

The Committee considered a copy of the Executive Forward Programme as set out on Agenda pages 27 to 35.

The Chairman referred to the expected decision in relation to the Council's Library Offer on page 31 of the Agenda, (WBC755) which was scheduled to be considered by the Executive on 24 September 2015. He suggested that the Library Offer was an issue that could be of potential interest for the Committee to consider at its September meeting. The

Committee was informed that he had had an initial discussion with Councillor Pauline Jorgensen, the relevant Executive Member who had indicated that she was open to the possibility of the Committee considering information on the item.

In relation to Local Planning Enforcement Plan, (WBC774) it was noted that the plan was due to be considered by the Executive at its meeting on 30 July 2015. In response to a question, Kevin Jacob commented that if the Members were minded to seek a follow up on the implementation of the Plan after it had been agreed by the Executive they could do so either through the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee or via the Community and Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Members would need to come to a view as to when they felt a reasonable amount of time had passed for them to be able to gain an accurate picture of the implementation.

**RESOLVED:**

- 1) That the Executive Forward Programme be noted;
- 2) That the further information on WBC755 – Library Offer be brought to the 7 September meeting and the item added to the Committee’s work programme.

**16. HOUSE OF MULTIPLE OCCUPATION - OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY REVIEW  
SUGGESTION FROM COUNCILLOR PARRY BAATH**

The Committee considered an overview and scrutiny review request submitted by Councillor Parry Baath as set out on Agenda pages 37 to 39 which asked for an overview and scrutiny review request to be undertaken into the Council’s approach to houses of multiple of occupation, (HMOs). The Committee also considered a supplementary briefing note on HMO prepared by Clare Lawrence, Head of Development Management and Regulatory Services that had been published and circulated after the main Agenda had been circulated.

In discussing the request, a number of Members commented that residents in their own Wards had raised similar concerns and complaints regarding houses of multiple occupation and they agreed that the issue was of current local concern that was becoming more common. Members felt that the issue was of sufficient importance to warrant further investigation. In discussion the following points were raised:

- If the issue was taken any further the policies of other local authorities should be examined for evidence of best practice;
- It was felt that there were potentially gaps in the Council’s response to the increase in HMOs within the Borough;
- There was a need to look at the different criteria and definitions of HMOs that existed within public protection, licensing and planning legislation. For instance would a property occupied by an extended family of more than 7 people constitute a HMO or was it necessary that the occupiers were privately renting to constitute a HMO? What were the different requirements for HMOs and other accommodation such as guest houses?
- There were important issues and risks associated with fire safety when properties were converted into HMOs that needed to be considered;

After discussion it was felt that Councillor John Kaiser, the Executive Member for Planning and Highways should be asked to consider the development of additional local policies on Houses of Multiple Occupation and to report back to the Community and Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee on his conclusions.

**RESOLVED:**

1) That the Executive Member for Planning and Highways be requested to consider the development of additional local policies on Houses of Multiple Occupation;

2) That the Executive Member for Planning and Highways be requested to report back on the outcome of this consideration to a future meeting of the Community and Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

**17. COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMMES**

The Committee considered its forward work programme and that of the Overview and Scrutiny Committees as set out on Agenda pages 41 to 69.

Kevin Jacob reported the following potential additional items to the Agenda for the 7 September 2015 Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee:

- Balanced Scorecard Quarter 1 2015/2016
- Library Offer
- Update on Highways and Transport Services Review
- New Grass Cutting Contract Briefing

It was noted that the Community Partnerships Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Corporate Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee had been amalgamated and a new Community and Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee established at the Council meeting on 23 July 2015. References within the work programme to the Corporate Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee now referred to the Community and Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Councillor Pauline Helliar-Symons referred to the expected future work programme of the Children's Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Councillor Norman Jorgensen in speaking to the future work programme of the Community and Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee highlighted that in September the Committee would be receiving further and more specific information in relation to the business case for the regeneration of Wokingham Town Centre and in November would be updated on the potential impact of the Government's extension of the Right to Buy Scheme.

Councillor Ken Miall in referring to the future work programme of the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee highlighted that the Committee would at its September meeting receive a briefing on the closure of the Independent Living Fund. The impact of the fund had the potential to have a significant financial impact on the Council. He commented that it was intended to invite Councillor Julian McGhee-Sumner, Executive Member for Health and Wellbeing to the meeting.

**RESOLVED:** That the current Work Programme of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee and the Overview and Scrutiny Committees be noted, subject to the additions set out above.



## **18. UPDATE REPORTS FROM CHAIRMEN OR NOMINATED MEMBER OF THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEES**

Councillor Ken Miall referred to the activities of the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee as set out in his written report which had been included on page 71 of the Agenda.

Councillor Norman Jorgensen referred to his report on the activities of the Corporate Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee which had been published and circulated separately from the main Agenda and also referred to the previous points he had made relating to the September meeting of the new Community and Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

It was noted that both Committees had considered the matters and scrutiny review requests referred to them by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee at its meeting on 1 June 2015.

Councillor Pauline Helliar-Symons provided a verbal update on the meeting of the Children's Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee on Tuesday 21 July 2015. The meeting had been well attended with a number of members of the public present to ask questions regarding the provision of sufficient primary school places in Earley. The following key points from the meeting were highlighted:

The Committee had considered reports on the Draft Primary School Provision Strategy for 2015-2018 and the Primary Place Planning and Allocation Process. The item on Primary Place Planning and Allocation Processes followed a request from the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee that it look at the issue of primary school place allocations as a result of an overview and scrutiny review suggestion submitted by Councillor David Chopping.

The Committee had noted the intention of Councillor Ian Pittock to establish a Member task and finish group to oversee the development of the Draft Primary School Provision Strategy and had appointed Councillor Ken Miall as the representative of the Children's Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the task and finish group. In considering and discussing the report, the Children's Overview and Scrutiny Committee had noted the measures used by the Council to try and estimate the demand for school places and the problems that had arisen in the Earley area in the current admissions round whereby some 30 parents had been unable to secure places at their preferred primary schools for entry in September 2015. The Committee was also informed of the measures put in place to identify and act on misleading applications for school places and the actions which were planned to create additional capacity within Reception and Year 1 in seven Earley schools for the 2016/2017 academic year. Overall, the Committee had been reassured that the problems identified in the two reports were being addressed.

The Committee had also considered a report on the development, purpose and function of the Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub, (MASH). The role of such multi agency hubs was to make it possible for all professionals working with children to identify risk early and put in place plans to address them. In this way the risks of a child slipping through the safeguarding net could be mitigated. Councillor Helliar-Symons commented that this was part of the improvement in the way in which the Council worked with other partners such as the police and NHS in sharing information.

Councillor Helliar-Symons also stated that the Children's Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee has been informed that the Council had been successful in meeting the challenge of recruiting sufficient children's social workers through the recruitment of five staff from Australia.

Finally, Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee were informed that the issue of the effect of the Government's planned implementation of 30 hours free nursery provision had been discussed. Members of the Committee had been concerned about the effect of the proposals on nurseries within the Borough because of the increases in their costs. It has been noted that Officers were preparing an consultation response to the Government on the issue.

**RESOLVED:** That the reports of the Overview and Scrutiny Chairman and the actions outlined within their reports be noted.

## MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE HELD ON 28 JULY 2015 FROM 7.00 PM TO 8.20 PM

### **Committee Members Present**

Councillors: Ken Miall (Chairman), Kate Haines (Vice-Chairman), Laura Blumenthal, Philip Houldsworth, Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey, David Sleight, Bill Soane and Alison Swaddle

### **Others Present**

Carol-Anne Bidwell, Public Health Project Officer  
Madeleine Shopland, Principal Democratic Services Officer  
Darrell Gale, Consultant in Public Health  
Dr Debbie Milligan, Wokingham Clinical Commissioning Group  
Jim Stockley, Healthwatch Wokingham  
Councillor Tim Holton

### **12. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were submitted from Councillors UllaKarin Clark, Malcolm Richards and Bob Wyatt (substituted by Bill Soane).

### **13. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 3 June 2015 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### **14. DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest made.

### **15. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

There were no public questions.

### **16. MEMBER QUESTION TIME**

There were no Member questions.

### **17. UPDATE ON NHS 111**

Dr Milligan of Wokingham Clinical Commissioning Group provided the Committee with an update on NHS 111. Her CCG responsibilities included NHS 111 and she was a lead for Berkshire West for the recommissioning of the service.

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

- Nationally the need to redesign Urgent and Emergency Care had been recognised. Pressures across health, social and community care were significant. A fundamental redesign was required of front door access (NHS 111, 999, Out of Hours (OOH), A&E, Community, Social Care).
- Dr Milligan outlined the vision for change:
  - people with urgent but non-life threatening needs get responsive, effective and personalised services outside of hospital;
  - people with more serious or life threatening emergency have treatment in centres with the very best expertise and facilities.
- Integrated 24 hour 7 day a week access, advice and treatment services were needed.

- The Berkshire West Vision for Urgent Care was outlined in the Berkshire West 5 Year Strategy.
- Dr Milligan took Members through the Berkshire West model of care.
- NHS 111 had started 3 years ago as a pilot and was now due to be reprocured. Berkshire West had joined up with Berkshire East, Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire for the procurement process.
- Dr Milligan took Members through some of the common myths relating to NHS 111;
  - *Patients wait hours to be answered* – 97% of calls were answered within 60 seconds.
  - *Callers have to wait hours for a clinical call back* – 82% of calls were closed at the first stage and of those transferred only 1% waited more than 10 minutes for a call back.
  - *Public do not know when to call NHS 111* – statistics suggested that marketing had been successful for NHS 111 as an urgent care service.
  - *NHS 111 does not refer to primary care* – nationally 67% of callers were referred to primary care or the out of hours service. 6.8% of call in Berkshire West were referred to the Emergency Department and 8% had an ambulance dispatched.
  - *NHS 111 refers people to A&E who would not have gone there otherwise* – statistics suggested that this was not the case.
  - *NHS 111 is increasing the pressure on A&E* – 79% of NHS Confederation members had said it was not a big cause of pressure on A&E.
- Some changes had been made such as increased clinician input.
- The current NHS 111 and Out of Hours landscape was complex with non-coterminous boundaries, non-aligned 111 and OOH contracts, non-aligned with ambulance and other services and non-aligned performance and incentives. NHS England had confirmed in early July that closer integration of NHS 111 and OOH would be required.
- Following a formal announcement at the National Conference in May, the direction of travel and procurement for NHS 111 and OOH services were paused until after September 2015. Revised commissioning standards and supporting procurement advice for integrated services were due in September.
- The OOH service would be aligned with the NHS 111 service and a specification for the OOH service considered. There would be a move towards a 24 hour 7 day integrated model.
- Councillor Miall asked about peak call times and was informed that the NHS 111 provider, South Central Ambulance Service, had considerable experience of modelling for peak times and staff numbers were planned accordingly. Nationally there had been a 40% increase in calls to NHS 111 between Christmas and New Year.
- In response to a Member question regarding staff ratios, the Committee was informed that the ratio was four call handlers to one clinician (nurse or paramedic). There were also floor walkers who could offer support to less experienced call handlers if required.
- Councillor Miall referred to a recent undercover investigation of the 111 service by a Daily Telegraph journalist. Members were assured that an internal investigation was being carried out.
- Members questioned what difference NHS 111 had made. Dr Milligan commented that GPs were seeing fewer urgent cases and those who could be dealt with via other means such as pharmacy.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr Milligan be thanked for her presentation.

## **18. SEXUAL HEALTH SERVICES RECOMMISSIONING**

The Committee received a report and presentation on the recommissioning of sexual health services.

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

- Mandated services provided by Public Health included:
  - NHS Health Check;
  - Sexual Health (STI testing and treatment);
  - Sexual Health (Contraception);
  - Protection;
  - Public Health advice to Clinical Commissioning Group;
  - National Child Measurement Programme.
- From October Public Health responsibilities would increase further.
- The Public Health budget for 2014/15 was £4,223,000. 36% of this had been spent on sexual health services, including non-mandated prevention.
- A total of £1,315,000 had been spent on sexual health services in 2014/15 (mandated STI testing and treatment £862,000 and mandated contraception £317,000).
- Under the Venereal Diseases Act 1974, patients could access any sexual health clinic in the UK regardless of area of residence and could do so anonymously. The provider Trusts, if given sufficient information by the patient, could then invoice the local authority of resident of the patient. The Council had received invoices from some 37 providers or Trusts across the country and in 2014/15 had paid a total of £39,748 for such out of area sexual health services.
- The East Berkshire service at the Garden Clinic in Slough had cost the Council £41,720 and the West Berkshire service at the Florey Clinic has cost £735,610. Neighbouring providers under contract had cost £26,580 and primary care services in Wokingham had cost £130,542.
- It was important that sexual health commissioners were aware of cultural changes and outbreaks of different infections. Cultural changes and increased use of social media to make sexual connections had an impact on the type of service provision required. The Committee was provided with statistics regarding the number of people in the Borough that day seeking sex online. Members were also informed that there had been a recent increase in the number of people diagnosed with syphilis in the Berkshire area and that Public Health had co-ordinated a campaign to address this.
- Some sexual health services such as HIV treatment and termination of pregnancy services were not the commissioning responsibility of Public Health and as such had not been included in the process. Nevertheless, in order to provide a virtual integrated service for residents, joined-up sexual health provision required close collaboration between the Council and the providers and commissioners of these services.
- Chlamydia screening had also been excluded from the tender process because Berkshire Healthcare Foundation Trust, who ran the service in the East of Berkshire as well as the West under two separate contracts, had agreed to introduce Dual Testing for Chlamydia and Gonorrhoea throughout the county at no extra cost within the current financial year.
- Local stakeholder events were held across Berkshire in January and February 2014 to feedback the findings of the sexual health needs assessment. The stakeholder

events helped to determine local priorities and services and the outcomes fed into the service specification.

- Recommendations from the Sexual Health Needs Assessment had included:
  - Central web based information resource on services in Berkshire;
  - Integration and closer working between services;
  - Maintenance of integration between HIV and sexual health services;
  - Strategic approach to the provision of services;
  - Improved access and its challenges.
- Reprourement discussions had revealed that different approaches were required in East and West Berkshire. Bracknell and Slough had agreed to remain with their current provider, Berkshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust. The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead had felt that they should test the market to consider their options and had agreed to enter into the tendering process in partnership with the West of Berkshire councils. However, after tenders were received; they decided to pull out of the procurement exercise. The Berkshire West councils had written a service specification and financial specification had been defined.
- The current provider Royal Berkshire Hospital Foundation Trust had been awarded a new three year contract, which had come into effect from 1 April 2015.
- A new IT platform and website was being developed across Berkshire which would provide information for residents and bring together all sexual health related services, including advice on child sexual exploitation, as a one stop shop.
- The Gauge Clinic, a walk in clinic specifically for men who had sex with men, had been developed.
- The Consultant in Public Health took Members through the savings that the new contract was estimated to bring about. It was anticipated that £196,000 would be saved each year for the three years of the contract. There was potential for additional savings in all years, although there was also a £20,000 risk in Year 1.
- Councillor Miall asked if there were links between the sexual health services and other services. The Consultant in Public Health commented that there were strong links between the sexual health services and other services such as those relating to drugs and alcohol.
- Information regarding the age range and genders of those using the sexual health treatment services and the different infections and treatments, was requested to give the Committee a clearer picture of local service users and the different infections and treatment.

**RESOLVED:** That

- 1) the process and outcomes of the re-procurement and recommissioning process be considered and that Members be aware of the rationale for the re-tendering, benefits achieved and reduction in overall costs.
- 2) Public Health be requested provide information regarding the age range and genders of those using the sexual health treatment services and the different infections and treatments.

## **19. HEALTHWATCH UPDATE**

Members received an update on the work of Healthwatch Wokingham Borough.

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

- Jim Stockley reminded Members of staffing levels within Healthwatch Wokingham Borough. There were also approximately 40 volunteers.
- Members were informed that as a result of a deaf blind champion walkabout at Wokingham Medical Centre a number of changes made to make it more accessible. A local sight impaired resident had met at the Citizens Advice with Healthwatch, SEAP (Support, Empower, Advocate, Promise) and a CAB representative to discuss access issues the resident was facing at their local GP practice.
- Healthwatch Wokingham Borough had introduced Twyford Village Partnership to the CCG Better Care Fund “Neighbourhood Cluster” project manager and they were willing to be a pilot site.
- There had been an excellent response to the young people’s emotional health survey which had been undertaken at St Crispin’s School. The results had been fed back to the service providers to inform challenges. Healthwatch Wokingham Borough had presented its findings back to the school. Members were referred to an animation on Healthwatch’s website which outlined the results. Healthwatch Wokingham Borough was working with the Deputy Headteacher to introduce a ‘Secret to Happiness’ workshop which would look at matters such as coping strategies. Three other schools had approached Healthwatch Wokingham Borough with a view to undertaking similar work. Councillor Haines questioned whether other schools would be encouraged to participate and was informed that this was possible.
- Healthwatch Wokingham Borough was looking for young people to help develop a wellbeing app.
- Jim Stockley informed the Committee that the volunteer driver project was progressing and that a blog and video inside a volunteer’s car was being created to highlight the challenges that they faced.
- Councillor Haines asked whether Healthwatch Wokingham Borough had received any feedback, particularly from residents with mobility, sight or hearing issues, on Reading Borough Council turning off some traffic light controlled crossings. Jim Stockley indicated that they had not. Darrell Gale indicated that the Council was planning changes to Wokingham town centre in conjunction with the Town Council, to ensure a better designed area for all. Two events would be held in September, one on a market day and one on a non-market day and those with mobility, sight or hearing issues would be invited to walk around and identify any issues. This invitation was also extended to Healthwatch Wokingham Borough.

**RESOLVED:** That the update on the work of Healthwatch Wokingham Borough be noted and Jim Stockley thanked for his presentation.

## **20. WORK PROGRAMME 2015/16**

The Committee considered the Work Programme 215/16.

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

- At the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee it had been proposed that the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee receive an update from the Executive Member for Health and Wellbeing on his area, including performance. Members requested that Councillor McGhee-Sumner be invited to provide an update on his area, including the impact of the delay of the second phase of the Care Act, at the September meeting.
- It was suggested that the Council’s representative on Berkshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust and Royal Berkshire Hospital Foundation Trust – Board of

Governors, Councillor Pitts, be invited to the Committee's September meeting to provide an update on his role and share information where appropriate. Contact between the Committee and the Council's representatives on the Trusts had in the past been minimal and there was a potential for information sharing.

- It was proposed that the Committee receive updates on the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) and the Health and Wellbeing Strategy (HWBS), the development of which were key responsibilities of the Health and Wellbeing Board, to assist in its holding of the Board to account. It was agreed to programme an update on the JSNA for the September meeting and an update on the HWBS for the Committee's January meeting.

**RESOLVED:** That amendments be made to the Work Programme 2015/16 as detailed above.



**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE  
STANDARDS COMMITTEE  
HELD ON 29 JULY 2015 FROM 8.00 PM TO 9.15 PM**

**Committee Members Present**

Councillors: Rob Stanton (Chairman), Chris Bowring, Roger Loader, Roy Mantel, Ken Miall, Malcolm Richards and Beth Rowland

**Officers Present**

Kevin Jacob, Principal Democratic Services Officer  
Andrew Moulton, Monitoring Officer  
Mary Severin, Deputy Monitoring Officer

**1. APOLOGIES**

An apology for absence was submitted from Councillor Pauline Helliard-Symons.

**2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 2 April 2015 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**3. DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

**4. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

There were no public questions.

**5. MEMBER QUESTION TIME**

There were no Member questions.

**6. PARISH / TOWN COUNCIL QUESTION TIME**

There were no Parish/Town questions.

**7. UPDATE ON COMPLAINTS AND FEEDBACK**

The Committee consider a report set out on Agenda pages 9 to 11 which gave an outline of the activity and results of the Councillor Complaints process since the last meeting.

Andrew Moulton, Monitoring Officer highlighted that in accordance with the agreed procedure he had taken a decision of no further action in respect of four complaints and one parish complaint had been determined at a full Standards Committee Hearings Sub-Committee. In the case determined at a hearing, the finding had been that the Councillor had breached the Code of Conduct of their parish council in three areas.

In looking at the complaints received and any trends or areas of further development for Councillors he referred to the growing use of social media by Councillors to engage with the public. Whilst social media represented a useful tool and an opportunity to Councillors there were also potential dangers and issues that Councillors needed to be aware of.

In addition it was proposed to undertake some further work on the issue of Councillor bullying with the objective of providing some local guidance to Councillors on the issue. Andrew Moulton commented that there were different genuinely held views around bullying

and what constituted bullying and an agreed local view or understanding would be helpful in the consideration of future complaints.

Finally, the Committee was informed that the Council's adopted processes for the consideration of complaints had recently been considered by the Local Government Ombudsman, (LGO) following a complaint from a member of the public who had been dissatisfied with the Council's response with regard to a complaint they had lodged. The LGO had found that the Council had followed its adopted processes correctly and it was useful to know that processes were considered to be adequate.

In discussing the item, the Chairman and various members of the Committee strongly supported the development of guidance on the use of social media by Councillors as it was felt that this was area where the immediacy of social media to a large potential audience was of particular impact. It was also felt that further guidance around bullying and what constituted bullying in practical terms would be welcome.

In respect of the complaints considered since April, Roy Mantel commented that as the Chairman of Twyford Parish Council he had some concern over the length of time it had taken to determine the complaint that had required a full hearing. Andrew Moulton and Kevin Jacob acknowledged this and explained why it had not been possible to determine it in a shorter period. It was recognised that all parties involved in any complaint wished to know the outcome as soon as possible.

#### **RESOLVED:**

- 1) That the report be noted;
- 2) That Officers be requested to draw up guidance to Members on the use of social media and bullying.

#### **8. REVISED PROCESS FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF CODE OF CONDUCT COMPLAINTS**

The Committee considered a report on Agenda pages 13 to 23 which set out a suggested revised process for the consideration of Code of Conduct complaints by the Borough Council in respect of complaints against Borough and Town/Parish Councillors.

Mary Severin, Deputy Monitoring Officer explained the key proposed changes to the process which had been developed in light of the experience gained in handling Code of Conduct complaints since 2012 and changes in best practice generally. The Committee was reminded that it had previously considered the proposed changes at its meeting in April. The proposed changes had been broadly endorsed at that time, but Members of the Committee had asked Officers to investigate the potential of including within the process an appeals mechanism for Councillors unhappy with the findings of a hearing.

The Committee was informed after looking into the issue of an appeals mechanism more closely the advice from Officers was that one not be included within the complaints process for the reasons set out on pages 14 and 15 of the report. In particular, it was felt that that the provision of an appeals mechanism would be contrary to the Government's intent of a 'light touch' in reforming the Code of Conduct regime, that the possible sanctions which could be imposed by a Hearings Sub-Committee were not of such severity to justify an appeal, that the majority of local authorities and unitary authorities did not operate such a provision and that it was felt that an appeals process would unnecessarily elongate the complaints process to the detriment of all parties.

The Chairman commented that the issue of whether an appeals mechanism should be put in place had in part arisen from a local case where the Councillor concerned had been unhappy with the outcome. However, he was satisfied with the advice that it should not be incorporated into the process. This was supported by the other members of the Committee.

The Committee then discussed the detail of each page of the proposed revised process. A number of points were discussed and it was decided to amend Paragraph 9.1.15.3 m) on Agenda page 21 to read *'The Panel will then determine the complaint on the balance of probabilities test. If the Panel determine that there has been a failure to follow the Code the Chairman Panel shall seek advice from the Monitoring Officer as to what action they believe should be taken against the Subject Member.'*

**RESOLVED:** That the revised Councillor Code of Conduct complaints process at para 9.1.13 to 9.1.16 of the Constitution be recommended to the Constitution Review Working Group for adoption by the Council subject to the amendment of paragraph 9.1.15 m).

## **9. UPDATE TO THE MEMBER OFFICER PROTOCOL**

The Committee considered a revised Member/Officer Protocol as set out on Agenda pages 25 to 42.

Andrew Moulton introduced the covering report and revised Protocol to the Committee and reminded members that the majority of the proposed document had been endorsed by the Committee in October 2014. Following that meeting further feedback had been received from the Council's Officer Corporate Leadership Team and incorporated within the document in Appendices 5 and 6.

The basic working assumption had been to produce a steamed lined basic protocol with a number of supporting appendices attached.

Members of the Committee endorsed the draft protocol with the following minor amendments:

- Paragraph 9.3.8 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, third line on Agenda page 29 – *'More serious complaints may involve alleged breaches of the Member Code of Conduct and the process for the consideration of Member Code of Conduct complaints is as set out in Chapter 9.1.13 of the Constitution initiated.'*
- Paragraph 9.3.8 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, fifth line on Agenda page 29 – *'Nothing in this process negates the right of Officers to make a Code of Conduct complaint directly to the Monitoring Officer if they wish'*
- Minor typographical and grammar corrections.

**RESOLVED:** That subject to the minor amendments made at the meeting the revised Member/Officer Protocol be endorsed by the Committee for onwards submission to the Constitution Review Working Group and Council for final approval.

**This page is intentionally left blank**

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF  
THE EXECUTIVE  
HELD ON 30 JULY 2015 FROM 8.42 PM TO 8.50 PM**

**Committee Members Present**

Councillors: Keith Baker (Chairman), Julian McGhee-Sumner, Charlotte Haitham Taylor, Pauline Jorgensen, John Kaiser, Anthony Pollock and Angus Ross

**Other Councillors Present**

Mark Ashwell  
David Chopping  
Lindsay Ferris  
Norman Jorgensen

**43. APOLOGIES**

An apology for absence was submitted from Councillor Philip Mirfin. The Leader confirmed that Councillor Mark Ashwell would be attending the meeting on behalf of Councillor Mirfin however in accordance with legislation he could take part in any discussions but was not entitled to vote.

**44. DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

Councillor Pauline Jorgensen declared a personal interest in Item 47, Council Owned Companies Business – Phoenix Avenue and Fosters, by virtue of the fact that her husband was a paid Non-Executive Director of WBC Holdings Ltd. Councillor Jorgensen remained in the meeting during discussions and voted on the matter.

**45. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

There were no public questions received.

**46. MEMBER QUESTION TIME**

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

**46.1 Lindsay Ferris asked the Leader of Council the following question:**

**Question**

Why has the cost for Phoenix Avenue (excluding the recommended £350,000 contingency) risen by 15% in just over 1 year?

**Answer**

First of all can I point out that this audited tender response has occurred nearly 18 months after the original estimate which is a bit more than “just over a year”. Officers and I have struggled to see how you have managed to get to a 15% increase where we have only managed 10%.

However I believe whether it is 10% or 15% is not really the thrust of your question it is that the increase appears to be large.

Now the original estimate was based on work approved at the January 2014 Executive Meeting. So any building estimate is always going to be higher after the passage of 18 months of time.

This is for multiple reasons such as: refinement of the specification which has certainly been the case here; materials costs generally rise with passage of time; such material costs rise even faster when individual items face shortages, for example bricks which are having to be imported; labour costs generally rise with the passage of time; and again as with materials if there is a shortage of certain types of skills the costs rise even faster; eg bricklayers.

This is not just us saying this as the Council owes a duty of care with respect to spending money and therefore its company, WHL naturally asked reputable "Property and Construction Consultants" called Ridge to review this tender response. Their report reinforced the comments I have just made saying, and this is a direct quote from the report:

"Labour shortages have become an increasing concern as the market continues to rise. Bricklayers are particularly scarce due to the sharp increase in house building, and we are seeing shortages across all of the main trades and professions due to the amount of work within the industry. In addition materials shortages have become more of a constraint especially bricks and blocks, however we have started to see this trend in other areas as supply chains struggle to cope with the acceleration in activity levels. The result of both these trends means that lead times, delivery times and programmes are all starting to lengthen, which is having a negative effect on prices."

Therefore it is totally unrealistic to expect an estimated cost set in January 2014 to remain the same some 18 months later.

### **Supplementary Question**

My comment that I would make about the 15% is that the paper talks about a 10%, or just over 10% increase, but it is spread across two projects and when you go into the individual projects you will find that the one I asked about is 15% and the other one is lower - so that is why it is 15%.

Is there likely to be any further increases and could this have any implications for the viability of the project?

### **Supplementary Answer**

Not as far as we are aware but clearly it is a moving feast. We don't expect any.

## **47. COUNCIL OWNED COMPANIES BUSINESS - PHOENIX AVENUE AND FOSTERS**

*(Councillor Jorgensen declared a personal interest in this item)*

The Executive considered a report relating to a request for further funding for the development of Phoenix Avenue and Fosters Extra Care Home.

The Leader of Council explained the necessity for the additional funding to that previously assigned by the Executive, at its meeting in January 2014, to WHL for both Phoenix Avenue and Fosters Extra Care Home projects. At the same meeting a further sum of £18m was agreed to be made available for future developments subject to agreement by the Executive. Now that a further quote had been received, plus anticipated increases to the Fosters project, there was a need for £2.141m to be made available from the

previously agreed £18m. By way of clarification Councillor Baker confirmed that it was not new money that was being requested but funds that had already been allocated by the Executive to WHL for development projects.

Councillor Baker also clarified that the £2.141m was only required in the current financial year and not future years as was suggested in the financial implications table in the report.

**RESOLVED** that:

- 1) the resolution of WBC (Holdings) Limited to approve further funding for the build of Phoenix Avenue and Fosters be noted;
- 2) further funding of up to £2.141million for the development of Phoenix Avenue and Fosters Extra Care from Council capital resources and to on-lend to WBC (Holdings) Limited at interest rate of 6% be approved.

**This page is intentionally left blank**



**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF  
THE EXECUTIVE  
HELD ON 30 JULY 2015 FROM 7.30 PM TO 8.40 PM**

**Committee Members Present**

Councillors: Keith Baker (Chairman), Julian McGhee-Sumner, Charlotte Haitham Taylor, Pauline Jorgensen, John Kaiser, Anthony Pollock and Angus Ross

**Other Councillors Present**

Mark Ashwell  
David Chopping  
Lindsay Ferris  
Norman Jorgensen

**24. APOLOGIES**

An apology for absence was submitted from Councillor Philip Mirfin. The Leader confirmed that Councillor Mark Ashwell would be attending the meeting on behalf of Councillor Mirfin however in accordance with legislation he could take part in any discussions but was not entitled to vote.

**25. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Minutes of the meeting of the Executive held on 25 June 2015 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**26. DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

Councillor Anthony Pollock declared a personal interest in Item 31, Council Owned Companies Business, by virtue of the fact that he was an unpaid Non-Executive Director of Optalis. Councillor Pollock remained in the meeting during discussions and voted on the matter.

Councillor Pauline Jorgensen declared a personal interest in Item 31, Council Owned Companies Business, by virtue of the fact that her husband was a paid Non-Executive Director of WBC Holdings Ltd. Councillor Jorgensen remained in the meeting during discussions and voted on the matter.

**27. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

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

**27.1 Gill Purchase had asked the Executive Member for Children's Services the following question:**

**Question**

Could the Lead for Children's Services please tell parents in the South of Wokingham the names of the preferred Education providers that have been put forward to the DfE to run the secondary school along with the reasons why they were considered to be the best?

In light of Gill Purchase being unable to attend the meeting the following written answer was provided:

## **Answer**

The field of shortlisted providers was strong and the decision by the panel of six was unanimous.

From the initial six expressions of interest, five applications were received and following the withdrawal of Waingels, four trusts were interviewed:

- Bohunt Education Trust;
- Kings Group;
- Maiden Erlegh Trust; and
- GLF Schools.

The interview panel consisted of two senior Officers from WBC's Learning and Achievement Service, two councillors (Executive and Deputy Executive Members for Children's Services) and two parents. It was chaired by WBC's Head of Strategic Commissioning, Brian Grady.

All four Trusts gave very strong presentations and interviews. However, Bohunt's submission and vision was truly inspiring and included the following features:

- The early appointment of leadership in advance of the selection of the provider;
- Secondly being prepared to challenge pupil performance and setting stretching targets;
- Innovative and exciting approaches to pedagogy and curriculum;
- Analysis of local data and understanding of community needs;
- As well as a detailed and comprehensive application.

Bohunt Education Trust was also particularly strong in business management and they had considered all the issues and views raised by parents well.

Bohunt Education Trust clearly understood the timetable for the delivery of our new school and demonstrated how they would 'hit the ground running' and provide dedicated leadership from the outset".

### **27.2 Sam Dredger had asked the Executive Member for Children's Services the following question:**

#### **Question**

It has been reported on the Project 16 Facebook page there is a delay in the start of building work for the South of Wokingham school. Could she offer an explanation as to why and will this delay have an impact on the delivery of the school for September 2016.

In light of Sam Dredger being unable to attend the meeting the following written answer was provided:

#### **Answer**

The Facebook site reported and I quote: "To date the Project is progressing albeit with some delays on site handover. This is due to need to clear topsoil from the site before the builders can take over the site and commence groundworks. Whilst this early delay is unhelpful, it is not critical at this time".

This is correct. There have been some delays associated with the remediation of the school site which is not unusual when working on brownfield sites such as this. As with

any construction project the programme is monitored weekly and the timetable is under continuous review. As work progresses there will, I suspect, be a variety of issues that might arise, the impact of each will be considered within the overall project timetable. However the Council and the provider, the Bohunt Trust remain committed to and confident of the opening of this new secondary school in September 2016. It will be the first new secondary school that this Borough has built for over 40 years.

**27.3 Philip Meadowcroft had asked the Executive Member for Planning and Highways the following question:**

**Question**

Will the Executive please tonight defer the adoption of the revised LPEP until after the next Corporate Services Overview & Scrutiny Committee meeting in September?

Why?

The officers' response, and their consequent revisions, to the LPEP arising from measured comments in the public consultation require a diligent review and assessment by the Corporate Services Overview & Scrutiny Committee. Since the public consultation the Committee has not had any further discussion on the LPEP.

There are a number of material and serious omissions; here are two examples. Firstly, nowhere in the revised LPEP is there any reference to Green Belt. This is an extraordinary omission given the impact of Green Belt on planning issues especially in the northern parishes of the Borough. Secondly, in seeking to clarify "planning harm", the revised LPEP incorporates some, but not all, of the framework developed by Tendring Borough Council (which was suggested in consultation responses). Specifically, the omissions are "irreversible harm" and "special exercises". The revised document, as well as the omissions I have mentioned, need to be appropriately overviewed and scrutinised and that is not the purpose or function of an Executive meeting like tonight's with a very full agenda.

It would thus be a material failure of sound and proper governance by the Executive to adopt the revised LPEP tonight. The Executive needs the assurance – which it presently does not have - that the revised LPEP has passed through a proper assessment procedure by the Corporate Services Overview & Scrutiny Committee prior to the LPEP being formally submitted to the Executive for adoption.

In light of Mr Meadowcroft being unable to attend the meeting the following written answer was provided:

**Answer**

The Council is keen to adopt the LPEP in its current state to be able to set out to local residents the level of service that can expect from the planning enforcement service. The LPEP has been 18 months in preparation and considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on four separate occasions. The OSC has influenced the content of the document which has received wide support from elected members and should be implemented as soon as possible.

There is no reference to the Greenbelt in the LPEP because the LPEP sets out procedures for planning enforcement and the level of service that will be provided. Greenbelt designation is a specific planning policy and it is not appropriate to refer to specific planning policies in the plan. Planning policy is assessed as part of the tool to assist with assessing harm (appendix 1 of the LPEP). This tool has been adopted from the model

used by Tendring District Council and adapted to meet circumstances within Wokingham Borough.

As a result of the enforcement review, the planning enforcement service has received a greater level of resource at a time when many councils have reduced the enforcement activity considerably. However, there are still limited resources to deal with the 700 cases that the authority receives each year and the LPEP sets out how these resources will be allocated.

**27.4 Tom Berman had asked the Executive Member for Highways and Planning the following question:**

**Question**

In the revised LPEP officers have not addressed the issue of ward members being given a deadline of only 48 hours to challenge an expediency report proposing that an identified breach not be pursued and the case (concerning enforcement) be closed.

Will the Executive please agree that this matter should be revisited by the Director of Environment and the LPEP further amended to allow ward members a more reasonable deadline in such cases?

In light of Mr Berman being unable to attend the meeting the following written answer was provided:

**Answer**

48 hours notification is given to ward members about the closure of enforcement cases and this issue is addressed in both the report to Executive and summary of consultation responses attached to this report. The majority of the closures of cases are due to there is no breach of planning legislation or due to voluntary compliance. In less than 0.1% of cases is the closure due to it not being expedient to take action.

The majority of ward members feel that the 48 hour timescale is adequate as there are opportunities through the whole investigation process forward members to become involved in enforcement cases. There has been wide support from ward members for the LPEP which has been 18 months in preparation. It is important that this document is adopted as soon as possible to set out the level of service and the process for planning enforcement in the Borough.

**27.5 Ian Clarke asked the Executive Member for Environment the following question:**

**Question**

Agenda Item 41: Will Wokingham Borough Council consider broader options for the proposed new pavilion, to provide additional streams of income, such as a hireable space for social events, in order to give the site a better chance of being self-financing?

**Answer**

Just to confirm that we are talking about the Ryeish Green Pavilion as opposed to any other ventures that we are progressing.

Ensuring the long-term viability of a local community asset is a key consideration when delivering new facilities within the Borough, which includes opportunities to generate

income in different ways over time. The type of pavilion we would expect to deliver within the Shinfield Sports Hub will be built to conform to Sport England guidelines and would include a club room which would be able to accommodate a variety of other uses, in addition to the primary purpose of supporting outdoor sports.

We would be very open to ideas of how best we can provide a facility to meet local needs within the context of overall financial considerations. We will of course look closely at any ideas put forward. When assessing whether to introduce new ways to generate income, the Council will always want to understand the views of local residents and service users alongside the potential income or profits which can be achieved.

### **Supplementary Question**

You know the pavilion at Charvil Farm Park are you talking about that sort of size because they have a meeting room there with changing rooms etc?

### **Supplementary Answer**

We have not determined the size of that yet so that will be part of what we will be considering.

Councillor Keith Baker commented as follows:

I think the basic principle of any community facility, whether it is sporting or otherwise, being self-financing is absolutely essential. It has to be that way because we cannot go to our tax payers, being it parish or Borough, to continue to subsidise some of these facilities.

### **27.6 Andrew Grimes asked the Executive Member for Planning and Highways the following question:**

Agenda Item 42: Shinfield Parish Council understands that the outline specification of this community centre was:

- originally determined by Wokingham Borough Council;
- approved on appeal for the West of Shinfield development;
- and that Wokingham Borough Council entered into a S106 variation agreement with the University of Reading last year.

It is, therefore, with some concern, we note that, only after the questioning by Shinfield Parish Council, that a funding gap has only recently been recognised. Please could you explain the details concerning how the level of funding was originally obtained and agreed, and why does it not appear to cover present day costs?"

### **Answer**

The mechanism for funding and the process for going forward in partnership with the Borough Council has been discussed between the two Councils over the past few months.

In summary the legal agreement for Shinfield West facilitates the option for us to take a cash alternative to the new community building proposed near to the existing village hall by the applicant so that we can enable the Parish Council's preference for an extended Parish Hall on the Royal British Legion site.

The scope of the project is now greater than the originally secured on-site provision which was to serve the new development proposed. In acknowledgement that the extension to the existing Village Hall would be more valuable to both existing and future residents, in addition to the dedicated sum secured, flexibility was built into the agreement which

enables us to use our discretion over the commuted sums to deliver the SDL related infrastructure where the need arises. This together with the commitment the Parish Council was originally intending to make in purchasing the British Legion site will enable us together to provide what I hope will be a superb facility.

What I am basically saying here is that the original S106 was based around the development of the community centre on the SDL upon the request of the Parish Council. Now the shortfall is in your hands because we are not designing it; it is your design. If you wish to design a smaller building or a larger building that is the situation.

### **Supplementary Question**

Does that imply that we can come to an agreement on the total budget of the scheme and the funding of it over the next couple of months?

### **Supplementary Answer**

There are no estimates yet and so talking about overspends and underspends is a bit premature because until we see the plan and the business case that you are putting forward we will not know those details. But this is very much in your hands.

Keith Baker commented as follows:

There is no extra money other than the SDL money so whatever is designed has to fit in within that budget. If you want to go over that budget then there has to be alternative methods. But unfortunately the Borough does not have cash that we can add anywhere in the Borough I am afraid.

## **27.7 Dawn Peer asked the Executive Member for Planning and Highways the following question:**

### **Question**

Agenda Item 42: Shinfield Parish received 73% of all new homes in the borough between 2001 and 2011 (Source: Census data) without any material infrastructure improvements. Please could you explain and justify the reasons why Wokingham Borough Council considers that the ratepayers of Shinfield Parish should contribute to the shortfall of construction costs of this centre, when it is intended that this building is part of the mitigation of the development of some 2,500 new homes in the parish?

### **Answer**

I don't think that anyone would disagree that Shinfield has been subject to historic under investment in infrastructure and this was very much due to the policies during the time prior to the current Local Plan. The current SDL developments are based on our new policies and they are designed to wash their own face. This is the basis on which planning applications must be determined; they cannot make up for historic deficit, though they do prevent the impact being compounded through ongoing, unplanned incremental growth. As such all SDL developments have achieved about £28k per dwelling payment towards the provision of local infrastructure and 35% affordable housing.

In the case of Shinfield, the Parish Council wished to secure a different means of delivering their Community Building than that anticipated when the planning consent was approved. The Parish has been working with the Borough to deliver this enhanced alternative. The Parish was proposing to acquire the Royal British Legion site to do this. This Council has however secured a route by which the acquisition cost is covered by the University of Reading and it is therefore only fair that the original investment continues to

be committed to the scheme by the Parish. Flexibility does exist within the legal agreement and developer contributions to deliver a new and extended community provision in Shinfield Village Centre in partnership with the Borough. I would say again, as I have just said to Andrew, that it is in your hands. It will be your community centre. You will decide what design you want. So if you want to build the Taj Mahal then obviously you will be paying a lot more money. So it is very much in your hands.

### **Supplementary Question**

I think basically your response and Keith's response has overwritten my supplementary question but I would assume that we can still talk to the Officers and carry on negotiating the best we can?

### **Supplementary Answer**

I put a paper to our Group just the other day which actually talked about negotiation and business plans.

## **28. MEMBER QUESTION TIME**

There were no Members' questions received.

## **29. REVENUE MONITORING 2015/16 - END OF JUNE 2015**

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

The Executive Member for Economic Development and Finance went through the report and highlighted that although current estimates showed an overspend at the end of the year of £450k work would be carried out throughout the year to ensure a balanced budget. In addition it was noted that the Council had significant reserves to cover unforeseen items.

Members' attention was drawn to the budget pressures included in the report including the fact that the DoE had withdrawn a grant after the budget had been approved. It was also noted that the Housing Revenue Account was predicting a net underspend of £115k and there was a net planned deficit this year on the schools budget of just under £700k and this would cause a reduction in the Council's reserves next year. Councillor Pollock advised that given the rise in birth rate in the area and austerity measures this was an area that needed to be reviewed on a regular basis as it would impact on all budgets.

**RESOLVED:** That the forecast outturn position of the revenue budget and the level of forecast balances in respect of the General Fund, Housing Revenue Account, Schools Block and the Authority's investment portfolio be noted.

## **30. CAPITAL MONITORING 2015/16 - END OF JUNE 2015**

The Executive considered a report setting out the Capital Monitoring report to the end of June 2015.

The Executive Member for Economic Development and Finance informed the meeting the end of the first quarter forecast a small overspend of £4,000, which given that the Capital Budget was in excess of £106m was a very small percentage. It was noted that a significant amount of the Capital Budget was being spent on schools, roads and the infrastructure for the Strategic Development Locations.

Councillor Pollock clarified why the spend profile was split between year 1 and 2 which was due to the fact that often a lot of preparatory work was required after a project was approved but before it actually started.

**RESOLVED:** That the Capital Monitoring report for the first quarter of 2015/16 be noted.

### **31. COUNCIL OWNED COMPANIES' BUSINESS**

*(Councillors Pauline Jorgensen and Anthony Pollock declared personal interests in this item)*

The Executive considered a report relating to an update on the operational and budget monitoring position for the month ending 30 April 2015.

The Leader of Council highlighted the changes in directorships of Wokingham Housing Ltd (WHL) and Loddon Homes which included Councillor John Jarvis, who had a strong background as a chartered surveyor, being made a director of WHL and Councillor Gary Cowan, who had previously been a director of WHL, being appointed as a director and chairman of Loddon Homes Ltd.

**RESOLVED** that:

- 1) the budget monitoring position for the month ending 30 April 2015 be noted;
- 2) the operational update for the period to mid June 2015 be noted.

### **32. HEALTH AND SAFETY ANNUAL REPORT 2014/15**

The Executive considered the Health and Safety Annual Report for 2014/15 which relates to occupational health and safety in respect of the Council's services and schools.

The Executive Member for Resident Services informed the meeting that although the number of incidents reported had increased significantly this was mainly due to a new recording system which made it easier to report health and safety incidents. Also one special school, who always reported a high number of incidents, had reported even more incidents in 14/15 which again it was felt was due more incidents being reported rather than an increase in incidents.

Councillor Jorgensen also highlighted that the Council had been supporting local schools with the provision of external defibrillators, following the tragic death of young person in Woodley, by providing advice and encouraging the purchase of them. In relation to next years' priorities it was noted that the intention was: to revise procedures and health and safety manuals to make them easier to use; to continue to develop the reporting system; to add extra training for management contractors; and to improve health and safety induction for service managers and elected Members.

The Executive Member for Children's Services advised that although the amount of reported school incidents had nearly doubled from the previous year this was due to better report and she hoped that there would be more continuity throughout all the schools. With regards to the provision of external defibrillators Councillor Haitham Taylor reported that work was being carried out to support schools which included looking at working with different charities that could provide the equipment.



**RESOLVED** that:

- 1) the corporate health and safety performance for 2014/15 be noted; and
- 2) the approach described and the health and safety priorities for the current municipal year be endorsed.

### **33. LOCAL PLANNING ENFORCEMENT PLAN**

The Executive considered a report relating to a proposed Local Planning Enforcement Plan (LPEP) which sets out the Council's policy and procedures in respect of planning enforcement in order to preserve and enhance the built and natural environment and protect public amenities.

The Executive Member for Planning and Highways advised the meeting that the focus in the first instance would be on negotiations to resolve breaches of planning control; to encourage local residents to talk to each other and developers to resolve issues. The Council also recognised that town and parish councils had an important part to play as the eyes and ears on the ground.

It was recognised that it was not always possible to resolve issues informally and the Council would monitor development and investigate reported breaches and when these gave rise to planning harm the Council would look to enforce using all legal powers at its disposal. This would include prosecution via the courts whilst at the same time looking to recover the cost incurred in pursuing such cases. It was noted that there were around 700 breaches reported per year; there was normally a workload of around 120 cases; and that approximately 1 in 8 of those reported actually ended up as breaches.

Councillor Kaiser further advised that the LPEP was a living document and it would be updated if issues arose that required it to be modified.

Councillor Jorgensen praised the Planning Enforcement Team for the work they had recently undertaken on developments in her ward.

**RESOLVED:** That the Local Planning Enforcement Plan (LPEP) be approved for adoption.

### **34. TREASURY MANAGEMENT ANNUAL REPORT 2014/15**

The Executive considered the Treasury Management Annual Report which covered the treasury activity during 2014/15 and the actual Prudential Indicators for 2014/15.

The Executive Member for Economic Development and Finance went through the report and highlighted a number of areas including: the fact that the low borrowing rates had enabled the Council to finance projects at a reasonable rate; there were some capital schemes that the Council was unable to fund due to the large number of high priority schemes and the finite amount of budget; the Council's debt and investment position and the fact that the in-house investment team had continued to outperform the external fund managers.

**RESOLVED** that:

- 1) it be noted that the report was presented to the Audit Committee on 23 June 2015;
- 2) Council be recommended to approve:
  - a) the Treasury Management Annual Report for 2014/2015; and

- b) the actual 2014/2015 Prudential Indications within the report.

### **35. TRAVEL PLANNING FOR MAJOR DEVELOPMENT SITES (SDLs)**

The Executive considered a report relating to Travel Planning for Major Development Sites (SDLs) which will provide effective planning on these sites enabling residents to make informed, safe and sustainable travel decisions from a range of transport options and help to manage the impact of congestion.

The Executive Member for Planning and Highways explained that as part of any planning application developers were required to detail how they would promote sustainable travel to new residents. Generally these travel plans were limited by time, content and the area of influence and the developer had little interest in the success of the plan therefore they were often considered amongst other things to be ineffective and expensive and do little to promote sustainable travel. The Council was proposing an alternative approach whereby a charge of £450 would be taken for every new SDL house build and this would be used to undertake the management of residential travel plans on behalf of the developers and provide travel planning initiatives.

Councillor Kaiser further advised that this initiative would also provide revenue of £5.6m for the period of the Core Strategy up to 2026.

Councillor Haitham Taylor welcomed this proposal and asked if during the planned workshops an understanding of the profile of the new residents could be ascertained including where they worked and why they were moving to the Borough in order that this information could inform the new travel plans. In addition Councillor Jorgensen asked that information on where people were starting their journey from and where they would be going to within the Borough or outside the Borough be collected to ensure that the wider affects, and not just those of the particular development, were considered. Councillor Kaiser confirmed that this was the intention.

Following a query by the Leader on the recommendation and whether it meant that periodically additional reports would come forward requesting the release of S106 funds Councillor Kaiser clarified that the Council had already been collecting a charge on new homes in the SDLs and the purpose of the request was to use these funds. He asked that consideration be given to allowing future charges on new homes to be used without the need to come back to the Executive. The Executive Member for Economic Development and Finance believed that in future years spending of this money would be part of the Medium Term Financial Plan but for this year the Executive would need to agree any further release of funds for the project. To clarify the process that would be adopted for further release of funds the Leader of Council asked that the Executive Member and the lead Officers consider a workable proposal and provide the Executive with a report on how the Council would approve the release and utilisation of these funds.

Members asked if there was any intention to get contributions from Bracknell Forest to mitigate the effects of developments on the boundary of the two Boroughs? Councillor Kaiser agreed to include discussions on this matter in the regular meetings that were held with Bracknell Forest.

**RESOLVED:** That the release of appropriate S106 funding totalling £263,000 to support an annual programme of sustainable transport initiatives within the Strategic Development Locations be approved.

### **36. LIBRARY SERVICE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM**

The Executive considered a report relating to the extension for up to two years of the Civica IT management system used by the Library Service.

The Executive Member for Resident Services informed the meeting that the current IT system managed book stock, hire charges, wi-fi, etc. A review was being undertaken on how the libraries would be managed in the future eg scope and products provided and therefore it was proposed to extend the current management system rather than tender for a replacement until the Council was clear what scope any replacement was required to cover. Also following an internal benchmarking exercise the current system was found to be 25% cheaper than the available alternatives.

Councillor Haitham Taylor brought to the meeting's attention that the summer reading scheme had started and the theme was "record breakers" and asked that everyone encourage children and young people to get involved in the scheme.

In response Councillor Jorgensen highlighted that Wokingham was one of the few areas in the country where the libraries have increased in usage and not only had the footfall increased but they had become more cost effective.

**RESOLVED:** That the current provision of the library service management system be extended for up to two years.

### **37. FUTURE DELIVERY OPTIONS FOR OPERATIONAL PROPERTY**

The Executive considered a report relating to the Future Delivery Options for Operational Property which proposed the establishment of a shared Building Service/Operational Property Service with the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead to be hosted by Wokingham Borough Council.

The Deputy Executive Member for Regeneration and Communities highlighted the benefits of the proposed shared service which included a substantial saving per annum and a future profit share. Councillor Ashwell confirmed that the proposed shared service would be responsible for a number of areas including: reactive maintenance; repairs to make good unplanned issues; planned maintenance; proactive repairs and maintenance of the Council's estate; letting management of contracts etc. It was noted that the proposed structure would allow other bodies to join in the future.

Councillor Ross asked that "blue light services" be added to recommendation 2 as there was a lot of synergy with these services. This amendment was agreed.

**RESOLVED** that:

- 1) a formal arrangement be sought with Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (RBWM) Council for the establishment of a shared Building Service / Operational Property Service;
- 2) the shared service be structured in such a way that it can form the basis for a wider, technical shared service with other Berkshire authorities or with other neighbouring authorities or the blue light services;
- 3) authority be delegated to the Director of Finance and Resources and Executive Member for Regeneration and Communities, to enter into discussions required to

finalise the business case and to establish the shared service, with a view to the new service being established as soon as practicable.

### **38. SHINFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

The Executive Member for Planning and Highways advised that following a request from Shinfield Parish Council he intended to defer consideration of this item until the September Executive. This deferment was agreed.

**RESOLVED:** That consideration of the Shinfield Neighbourhood Plan be deferred to the September Executive.

### **39. GROUND LEASE TO THE SOUTH EAST RESERVE FORCES AND CADET ASSOCIATION (SERFCA) ON LAND AT ELIZABETH PARK, WOKINGHAM**

The Executive considered a report relating to the granting of a new 25 year ground lease to the South East Reserve Forces and Cadet Association (SERFCA) on land at Elizabeth Park, Wokingham which would replace their existing facilities on the Carnival Pool site.

The Deputy Executive Member for Regeneration and Communities advised that following approval of the planning application for the carnival Pool site redevelopment as a leisure quarter for Wokingham Town, which included the introduction of a new multi-storey car park, there was a need to find an alternative location for the Army Cadet Force and Air Training Corps who currently occupy the cadet compound on Carnival Field.

Following work carried out with SERFCA, the MODs managing body, a new site had been found at Elizabeth Park which would be a co-location with the existing football club. Both the Cadets and the football club were happy with the proposal. In response to a query Councillor Ashwell confirmed that the lease would be provided on a peppercorn rent and it would be the responsibility of the Cadets to pay for any building on the site. In addition if the lease came to an end then the site would be put back to its original state or the Council would take over the building.

**RESOLVED:** That a new 25 year ground lease be granted to The South East Reserve Forces and Cadet Association (SERFCA) on Land at Elizabeth Park, Wokingham which will replace their existing facilities on the Carnival Pool site.

### **40. REGENERATION OF PEACH PLACE COMPULSORY PURCHASE**

The Executive considered a report relating to the regeneration of Peach Place compulsory purchase order (CPO) which would enable the compulsory acquisition of all necessary land interests to deliver the regeneration of Peach Place.

Members were advised by the Deputy Executive Member for Regeneration and Communities that a CPO was a legal function available to local authorities to obtain land, property or associated rights and was often used in regeneration projects where land ownership and rights were complex. Final approval of any CPO would be made by the Secretary of State and the process consisted of a series of stages that could potentially last up to a year. Ahead of the process it would be necessary for the acquiring authority to demonstrate that they had attempted to acquire all property and rights by private treaty. It was noted that the Council had been successful in acquiring property and rights over recent years.

Councillor Ashwell also confirmed that the proposal also included the appropriation of all of the land that the Council owned for planning purposes.

**RESOLVED** that:

- 1) the Council should make a compulsory purchase order ("CPO") to include the land required to deliver the proposed regeneration of land known as Peach Place, Peach Street, Wokingham as shown indicatively edged red on the draft plan at Appendix 1 of the report ("the Site") pursuant to section 226(1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) because it considers that:
  - (a) the acquisition of the land will facilitate the carrying out of the development, redevelopment or improvement of the Site; and
  - (b) the development, redevelopment or improvement of the Site is likely to contribute to the achievement of any one or more of the promotion or improvement of the economic, social and environmental well-being of the borough of Wokingham;
- 2) the Council should include within the CPO the acquisition of new rights within the Site as necessary under section 13 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 to facilitate the development, redevelopment or improvement on or in relation to the Site;
- 3) the Chief Executive, in conjunction with the Leader and Executive Member for Regeneration, be authorised to:
  - (a) take all necessary steps in relation to the Site to secure the making, the confirmation and, in accordance with a programme approved by the Executive, the implementation of the CPO including publication and service of all relative notices and the presentation of the Council's case at any Public Inquiry; and
  - (b) approve terms for the acquisition of legal interests (including rights) by agreement including for the purposes of resolving any objections to the CPO;
- 4) if the CPO is confirmed, to the extent that it is not already held for such purposes, that that part of the Site already within the Council's ownership as shown shaded green on the plan at Appendix 2 of the report be appropriated for planning purposes as described in section 226 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) on the date immediately before the Council implements the confirmed CPO by the making of a vesting declaration or service of notice to treat/notice of entry, such land being then no longer required for the purpose for which it is currently held.

**41. RYEISH GREEN AND GRAY'S FRUIT FARM SPORTS HUB PROJECTS**

The Executive considered a report relating to the proposed Ryeish Green and Grays Fruit Farm Sports Hub projects which would provide a much improved outdoor sports offer for both existing and new residents of Wokingham and Shinfield.

Members were advised by the Executive Member for Environment that S106 funding would cover the cost of the work. In relation to Grays Fruit Farm although the Council would not take control of the site until September 2017 it was important to start the process of consultation on the project including what facilities and sports would be provided.

With regard to Ryeish Green Councillor Ross advised that a lot of the consultation process had already been undertaken over the last few years and contributions had already been received from the Strategic Development Locations (SDLs) and the most important thing was the phasing of the project. It was noted that the phasing would require taking up some existing sports facilities at Ryeish Green to undertake drainage work and some of this work may require forward funding.

Councillor Ross also confirmed that in addition to the proposals for Grays Farm and Ryeish Green there were outdoor and indoor facilities being developed for all of the SDL developments and an internal working group was currently considering what specific types of provision should be offered in all these areas and these would be matched to the needs of each area and the communities therein.

**RESOLVED** That:

- 1) the release of S106 funding be agreed to progress a planning application for the co-located Wokingham Sports Hub facility at Grays Fruit Farm in South Wokingham to serve the North and South Wokingham Strategic Development Locations (SDLs);
- 2) the release of S106 funding be agreed to progress a planning application for the Sports Hub to serve the South of the M4 SDL and implement any proposals which may be authorised within the budget identified in the “Financial Implications” table within the report;
- 3) authority be delegated to the Director of Finance and Resources to forward fund the Ryeish Green Sports Hub scheme through short term borrowing where needed.

**42. COMMUNITY FACILITY AT SM4 STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENT LOCATION**

The Executive considered a report relating to proposed community facilities in Shinfield Village Centre.

Councillor Haitham Taylor highlighted that the proposed timescale of completion by 31 December 2015 was very tight and wanted to ensure that Shinfield Parish Council would be supported in order to meet this deadline and bring forward the proposals that would meet the community and leisure needs for both the current community in Shinfield and the wider area and also the future community that would be moving into the area. The Executive Member for Planning and Highways stated that there would be an element of flexibility as there was with all negotiations.

**RESOLVED** that:

- 1) the University of Reading be advised that WBC elect to accept a cash contribution in lieu of direct provision of a community building for Shinfield Village Centre, pursuant to the Shinfield West S106 agreement;
- 2) agreement in principle be given to develop the new community facilities to serve the South of the M4 SDL on the Royal British Legion site in Shinfield Village Centre subject to the Director of the Environment and Executive Member for Planning and Highways receiving from Shinfield Parish Council (SPC) a satisfactory form of
  - a) business case for erection of a community facility and its ongoing operation;
  - b) agreement to contribute funds towards the project (to be determined);

- c) agreement to suitable governance arrangements with WBC to enable provision of services which are consistent with 'Shaping Our New Communities' principles;
  - d) evidence of wider community support for the community facility
- 3) subject to 2) being satisfactorily concluded, initial feasibility, costings and other details to be worked up and reported back to the Executive to enable a planning application to be progressed;
- 4) in the event that resolution 2 is not met by 31 December 2015 that the community S106 will be released to WBC to implement community/leisure projects to support the South of the M4 SDL.

**This page is intentionally left blank**



# Agenda Item 6

Decision made in the presence of:  
Sarah Hollamby, Head of Development Policy and Planning  
Brendan Troy, CIL Manager  
Colm Ó Caomhánaigh, Democratic Services Officer

<b>INDIVIDUAL EXECUTIVE MEMBER DECISION RECORD SHEET IMD 2015-24</b>
--

<b>Title of the report</b>	<b>69 Beech Lane, Earley - CIL Liability</b>
----------------------------	--

**DECISION MADE BY** John Kaisir, Executive Member for Planning and Highways  
**ACTION BY** Heather Twaites, Director for Environment  
**DECISION MADE ON** 10 August 2015

### Recommendation contained in the report

It is recommended that the Executive Member for Planning and Highways writes off the CIL liability incurred at 69 Beech Lane, Earley.

### Decision

That the Executive Member for Planning and Highways writes off the CIL liability incurred at 69 Beech Lane, Earley.

### 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

<b>Director – Resources</b>	No comment
<b>Monitoring Officer</b>	No comment
<b>Leader of the Council</b>	'I reluctantly accept this decision but I am concerned about setting a precedent for the future.'

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

The report contained information relating to the financial or business affairs of a particular person.

### 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**

1. Planning application F/2013/0649
2. Retrospective Planning application F/2013/2111
3. Enforcement notice, ENF/2014/2414

**PUBLISHED ON:** 10 August 2015

**EFFECTIVE ON:** 18 August 2015

**CALL-IN PERIOD EXPIRES:** 17 August 2015

# Agenda Item 7

Decision made in the presence of:  
Sarah Hollamby, Head of Development Policy and Planning  
Manpreet Kanda, Team Manager, Land Use and Transport Team  
Colm Ó Caomhánaigh, Democratic Services Officer

<b>INDIVIDUAL EXECUTIVE MEMBER DECISION RECORD SHEET IMD 2015-25</b>
--

<b>Title of the report</b>	<b>Considering response to consultation of the Spelthorne &amp; Runnymede Draft SHMA</b>
----------------------------	--

**DECISION MADE BY** John Kaisir, Executive Member for Planning and Highways  
**ACTION BY** Heather Thwaites, Director of Environment  
**DECISION MADE ON** 10 August 2015

### Recommendation contained in the report

The Executive Member for Planning and Highways:

- 1) approves the comments outlined in the report; and
- 2) that the comments be submitted as a formal response to the Runnymede District and Spelthorne Borough Council's on their Draft Strategic Housing Market Assessment consultation.

### Decision

That the Executive Member for Planning and Highways:

- 1) approves the comments outlined in the report; and
- 2) that the comments be submitted as a formal response to the Runnymede District and Spelthorne Borough Council on their Draft Strategic Housing Market Assessment consultation.

### 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

<b>Director - Resources</b>	Clarification of points sought but no direct comments made.
<b>Monitoring Officer</b>	I have no specific comments to make on the report (23/7/15)
<b>Leader of the Council</b>	I fully support the responses detailed in this report (26/7/15)

**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**

Former South East Plan – the Regional Spatial Strategy. Available at:

<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20080531042335/http://www.gos.gov.uk/gose/planning/regionalPlanning/>.

Airports Commission recommendations relating to increasing Airport Capacity in South East England - available at:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/airports-commission>

Heathrow Airport Employment Survey 2008/09. Available at:

<http://www.heathrowairport.com/static/Heathrow/Downloads/PDF/Employment-survey.pdf>

Draft Runnymede and Spelthorne Strategic Housing Market Assessment available at:

<https://www.runnymede.gov.uk/article/10102/Housing-Policy-Documents-and-Guidance---Strategic-Housing-Market-Assessment-SHMA>

**PUBLISHED ON:** 10 August 2015

**EFFECTIVE ON:** 18 August 2015

**CALL-IN PERIOD EXPIRES:** 17 August 2015

# Agenda Item 8

Decision made in the presence of  
Matt Davey, Head of Highways and Transport  
Michael Horton, Senior Traffic Management Engineer  
Colm Ó Caomhánaigh, Democratic Services Officer

<b>INDIVIDUAL EXECUTIVE MEMBER DECISION RECORD SHEET IMD 2015-26</b>
--

<b>Title of the report</b>	<b>Nightingale Road, Campbell Road and Livingstone Gardens Woodley (Prohibition Restriction of Waiting) Order 2015</b>
----------------------------	--

**DECISION MADE BY** John Kaisir, Executive Member for Planning and Highways  
**ACTION BY** Heather Thwaites, Director of Environment  
**DECISION MADE ON** 11 August 2015

### Recommendation contained in the report

The Executive Member for Planning & Highways:

- 1) approves the formal sealing and advertisement of the (Nightingale Road, Campbell Road and Livingstone Gardens Woodley) (Prohibition and Restriction of Waiting) Order 2015; and
- 2) informs those who have responded to the consultation accordingly.

### Decision

That the Executive Member for Planning & Highways:

- 1) approves the formal sealing and advertisement of the (Nightingale Road, Campbell Road and Livingstone Gardens Woodley) (Prohibition and Restriction of Waiting) Order 2015; and
- 2) informs those who have responded to the consultation accordingly.

### 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

<b>Strategic Director - Resources</b>	No response
<b>Monitoring Officer</b>	No specific comments on the report.
<b>Leader of the Council</b>	I fully support this action following this request from the police.
<b>Town and Parish Councils</b>	
Woodley Town Council	No response during final consultation but did comment during TRO consultation process to say. <i>“Members of the Woodley Town Council Community Services Committee have considered the scheme to prohibit waiting on Nightingale Road and</i>

	<i>Campbell Road, Woodley, including the junction of Livingstone Gardens with Nightingale Road, and wish to respond in support of the proposal”.</i>
<b>Local Ward Members</b>	
Beth Rowland	Councillor Rowland had raised some concerns about the displacement impact of the proposals and so a meeting took place on site on Monday 6 <sup>th</sup> July. Officer explained the reasons for scheme and that the police had approached the council regarding safety concerns. Officer has subsequently spoken to the Councillor and discussed the police’s concerns and that they support the advertised proposals. Councillor has agreed that the scheme should go ahead subject to monitoring and that, if additional problems arise as a result of this proposal, then officers should investigate further solutions as appropriate. The Executive Member had been updated on 14 <sup>th</sup> July and wished the report to be finalised and the scheme implemented.
Laura Blumenthal	I confirm my support for this.
Thames Valley Police	I met on site some time ago with the local police (community support officers) and witnessed the problems first hand. The proposed scheme will help alleviate parking near the roundabout giving a clear line of site for motorist entering Campbell.

**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**

Notice of Intent, Statement of Reasons, Drawing Number 5049-2061A

**PUBLISHED ON:** 11 August 2015

**EFFECTIVE ON:** 19 August 2015

**CALL-IN PERIOD EXPIRES:** 18 August 2015

# Agenda Item 9

Decision made in the presence of:  
Matt Davey, Head of Highways and Transport  
Michael Horton, Senior Traffic Management Engineer  
Colm Ó Caomhánaigh, Democratic Services Officer

<b>INDIVIDUAL EXECUTIVE MEMBER DECISION RECORD SHEET IMD 2015-27</b>
--

<b>Title of the report</b>	<b>B3349 Basingstoke Road and Charlton Lane, Swallowfield</b>
----------------------------	---

**DECISION MADE BY** John Kaisir, Executive Member for Planning and Highways  
**ACTION BY** Heather Thwaites, Director of Environment  
**DECISION MADE ON** 11 August 2015

### Recommendation contained in the report

The Executive Member for Planning and Highways:

- 1) approves the permanent making of the WOKINGHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL (B3349 BASINGSTOKE ROAD AND CHARLTON LANE, SWALLOWFIELD) (EXPERIMENTAL 7.5 TONNES MAXIMUM GROSS WEIGHT RESTRICTION) ORDER 2015.
- 2) instructs officers to remove the advisory direction signs diverting traffic via Part Lane; and
- 3) informs those who have responded to the consultation accordingly.

### Decision

That the Executive Member for Planning and Highways:

- 1) approves the permanent making of the WOKINGHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL (B3349 BASINGSTOKE ROAD AND CHARLTON LANE, SWALLOWFIELD) (EXPERIMENTAL 7.5 TONNES MAXIMUM GROSS WEIGHT RESTRICTION) ORDER 2015.
- 2) instructs officers to remove the advisory direction signs diverting traffic via Part Lane; and
- 3) informs those who have responded to the consultation accordingly.

### 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

<b>Strategic Director - Resources</b>	No response
<b>Monitoring Officer</b>	I have no specific comments to make on the report.
<b>Leader of the Council</b>	I fully support the actions detailed in this report.
<b>Town and Parish Councils</b>	
Swallowfield Parish Council	Swallowfield Parish Councils supports

	the proposal for Basingstoke Road/Charlton Lane junction traffic signage and the removal of advisory signs in Riseley directing lorries via Part Lane.
<b>Local Ward Members</b>	
Cllr Stuart Munro	I entirely agree with the comments made by the parish council.

**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**

TRO documents, letters of objection and support , Drawing Number 5049-1831-C

**PUBLISHED ON:** 11 August 2015

**EFFECTIVE ON:** 19 August 2015

**CALL-IN PERIOD EXPIRES:** 18 August 2015



**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE  
HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD  
HELD ON 13 AUGUST 2015 FROM 5.00 PM TO 7.00 PM**

**Present**

Julian McGhee-Sumner	WBC
Dr Johan Zylstra	NHS Wokingham CCG
Keith Baker	WBC
Prue Bray	WBC
Beverley Graves	Business Skills and Enterprise Partnership
Dr Lise Llewellyn	Director of Public Health
Stuart Rowbotham	Director of Health and Wellbeing
Katie Summers	NHS Wokingham CCG
Dr Cathy Winfield	NHS Wokingham CCG
Andy Couldrick	
Jim Stockley	Healthwatch Wokingham
Alan Stubbersfield	

**Also Present:**

Carol-Anne Bidwell

**15. APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were submitted from Nick Campbell-White, Councillor Charlotte Haitham Taylor, Chief Inspector Rob France, Nikki Luffingham, Judith Ramsden and Kevin Ward.

**16. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 11 June 2015 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Vice Chairman.

**17. DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

Dr Zylstra declared a Personal Interest in Agenda Item 32 CCG Cluster profiles on the grounds that he was involved in the Neighbourhood Cluster work.

**18. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

There were no public questions.

**19. MEMBER QUESTION TIME**

There were no Member questions.

**20. ORGANISATION AND GOVERNANCE**

**21. WOKINGHAM LEARNING DISABILITY PARTNERSHIP BOARD - JOINT  
HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE SELF-ASSESSMENT**

The Board received a presentation on the Wokingham Learning Disability Partnership Board – Joint Health and Social Care Self-Assessment Framework.

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

- It was explained that the Joint Health and Social Care Self-Assessment Framework was annual report that checked how well health and social care services were working for people with learning disabilities and their families. Although non-mandatory, it was good practice.
- It asked for data, compliance and people's stories around three main areas: Staying Healthy, Keeping Safe and Living Well.
- Public Health, with the support of the Partnership, had completed the framework. 51 people had shared their stories and 38 people had attended an engagement event held to share the information collected and RAG ratings produced.
- The Board was informed of what was going well under and where improvements could be made under the three main areas.
- With regards to Staying Healthy it was noted that:
  - All GP practices were signed up to the Annual Health Check Direct Enhanced Service.
  - Good evidence of people with learning disabilities accessing prevention, health screening and health promotion opportunities. Dr Zylstra commented that cervical screening was on a three or five year rotation as was breast screening and that the figures provided seemed low.
  - Good evidence of reasonable adjustments being made in all areas of Primary Care.
  - The Learning Disability Co-ordinator role at Royal Berkshire Hospital was highly regarded.
- Where improvements could be made included:
  - The GP surgeries kept a register of people with learning disabilities, as per QOF requirements. Whilst data was aligned to the number of adults in receipt of social care the children's data did not reflect actual numbers. Dr Zylstra clarified that Under 18's were not included in the QOF.
  - Specific health improvement targets set in the Annual Health Check were not always integrated with the Health Action Plans.
  - The Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) did not have a chapter on learning disabilities. It was noted that the updated JSNA would include a learning disabilities section.
- With regards to Keeping Well it was noted that:
  - Good safeguarding reporting, training and partnership working, overseen by the Local Safeguarding Adults Board and the Local Safeguarding Children's Board. An easy read booklet that explained the safeguarding process was being written.
  - Training around the Mental Capacity Act and Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards was being provided.
  - Some people with learning disabilities and their families were being involved in training and recruitment in learning disability specific services, although this was not happening across all areas.
- Where improvements could be made included:
  - 69% of people with a learning disability had had an annual review of their care package. However, under 90% was rated as Red. Stuart Rowbotham indicated that the 69% related to the 2013/14 data, that the 2014/15 data was due late September and that improvements were expected.
  - More involvement from people with learning disabilities, their carers and families in the commissioning and monitoring of services and the recruitment and training of staff within the service, was needed.

- An amber rating had been received for the question asking if family carers and people with a learning disability agreed that all providers treated people with compassion, dignity and respect.
- With regards to Living Well it was noted that:
  - Good evidence of those with learning disabilities having access to reasonably adjusted sports and leisure activities and cultural services.
  - Evidence of reasonably adjusted services which helped improve and enhanced access to the community such as Safer Places scheme and Changing Places toilets.
  - Targets for getting people with learning disabilities into employment had been exceeded year on year.
  - Good transition mapping and planning.
- Where improvements could be made included:
  - There was uncertainty regarding the existence of a local Employment Strategy, meaning the Council's employment rating was set at amber, despite high numbers of those with learning disabilities in employment.
- Stuart Rowbotham emphasised that the Council was one of the higher performers in the country for assisting those with learning difficulties into employment and congratulated the employment services provided by Optalis. He also commented that any Employment Strategy would be out of date and that capacity regarding strategic support had reduced. However, he would take the matter back for further consideration.
- Dr Llewellyn indicated that Public Health had been successful in gaining McMillian funding for cancer services for those with learning difficulties. She requested that the assistance of the Partnership Board in discussions.

**RESOLVED:** That the presentation on the Wokingham Learning Disability Partnership Board – Joint Health and Social Care Self-Assessment Framework be noted.

## **22. CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S PARTNERSHIP UPDATE ON PRIORITIES AND THE EARLY HELP INNOVATION PROGRAMME**

Alan Stubbersfield, Head of Learning & Achievement updated the Board on the Children and Young People's Partnership priorities and the Early Help Innovation Programme.

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

- The Board was informed of progress made against the key priorities identified in the Wokingham Children and Young Peoples Plan 2014-2016 which were:
  - **Priority 1** - Refresh and renew our Early Help approach, building on what works well, empowering professionals to always keep child centred and designing service to enable excellent practice.
  - **Priority 1a** - As part of a renewed focus on Early Help, develop an integrated 0-5 offer across the Local Authority, health and early year's sector.
  - **Priority 1b** - As part of a renewed focus on Early Help, review emotional health and wellbeing services including primary CAMHS to improve the emotional health and wellbeing of vulnerable children and young people.
  - **Priority 2** - Ensure more Wokingham children have access to the best education and focus on delivering improvements for those most at risk of poor outcomes
  - **Priority 3** - Implement changes required to deliver on the Children and Families. Act 2014 and go further to bring the child and family into the centre of assessment, planning and support processes.

- With regards to Priority 2 it was noted that local A level results had bucked the national trend and had increased. Early Years result had also increased by 8%. This reflected the Council's aspiration to provide the best education for Wokingham children.
- Projects identified were linked together by the further development of the single partnership brand 'Wokingham for Children.'
- Board members were updated on the Early Help and Innovations Programme.
- A positive impact was being seen and staff turnover had reduced to 9.9%
- Board members noted the next steps for the Early Help and Innovation Programme.

**RESOLVED:** That:

- 1) the progress made against both Children and Young Peoples Plan Priorities and the Early Help and Innovation Programme be noted.
- 2) the proposed next step actions be endorsed.
- 3) a further report on impact and outcomes be received in the Autumn term, in particular with regards to Early Help.

### **23. CARE ACT REFORMS UPDATE**

The Director of Health and Wellbeing updated the Health and Wellbeing Board on the Care Act reforms.

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

- The Board was provided with an overview of reforms which had been due to be in place by April 2015.
- The Government had announced that the implementation of the Care cap of £72,000 would be delayed until April 2020, which meant that the local authorities would not have to pick up the costs until this time. However, there was no clear information yet about how this was to be funded. There would no longer be a need to assess self-funders from October (in preparation for April 2016). In addition there would be no impact on current social care customers who were fully funded by the local authority and self-funders and customers who paid full cost or contributed to the cost of their care would continue paying for their support until 2020.
- The increase in capital thresholds had also been delayed until April 2020. The current capital thresholds (upper limit for both residential and non-residential care was £23,250 and the lower limit £14,250) would continue to apply until that time. The delay would not impact on current customers.
- In addition the duty on councils to meet the eligible needs of self-funders in care homes at their request was delayed until April 2020. This would not create additional pressures on resources. The delay would have a positive impact on providers and local authorities; self-funders being entitled to lower rates negotiated by the local authority would potentially lead to destabilisation of the market and higher prices for the local authority.
- The implementation of a new appeals process for adult social care (to appeal against decisions made about care and support) was delayed until the Spending Review in Autumn. Social care customers and carers could still access to the existing complaints system.

- With regards to funding it was noted that the Department of Health was expected to advise local authorities on what would occur with the implementation funding in the light of the delay.
- The forthcoming Spending Review would determine the level of funding for social care.
- Dr Winfield commented that the NHS would be receiving a three year allocation and asked whether a similar arrangement would be put in place for local authorities.

**RESOLVED:** That the update on the Care Act reforms be noted.

#### **24. APPOINTMENT OF VOLUNTARY SECTOR REPRESENTATIVE TO HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD**

The Board received a report which proposed the appointment of a voluntary sector representative to the Health and Wellbeing Board.

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

- The Health and Wellbeing Board could appoint such additional persons to be members of the Board as it thinks appropriate. This could include representatives from other groups or stakeholders, such as the voluntary sector, who could bring in particular skills or perspectives, or have key responsibilities which can support the work of boards.
- The Council's Constitution, section 4.4.23, would require amendment to reflect the addition of a representative from the Voluntary Sector to the Health and Wellbeing Board.
- Councillor Bray expressed concern with regards to the proposal that the Health and Wellbeing Board agree amendments to its terms of reference in future without requiring the agreement of Council, due to the evolving nature of the Board.

**RESOLVED:** That

1) That Clare Rebbeck be appointed to the Health and Wellbeing Board as a representative from the Voluntary Sector.

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 addition of a Voluntary Sector representative on the Health and Wellbeing Board.

#### **25. DELEGATION OF RESPONSE TO CONSULTATIONS ON PHARMACY APPLICATIONS**

The Board received a report regarding the delegation of responses to consultations on Pharmacy Applications.

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

- The Health and Wellbeing Board was consulted on various types of applications for new pharmacy contracts in the Borough or adjoining areas.
- The Wokingham Pharmaceutical Needs Assessment did not make a recommendation for new pharmacy provision in the area at this stage.
- Due to the fact that the consultation periods for the applications might not coincide with the timing of the Health and Wellbeing Board meetings it was proposed that the

formulation of consultation responses on behalf of the Health and Wellbeing Board to pharmacy applications received from the Thames Valley Primary Care Agency, be delegated to the Consultant in Public Health in consultation with the Chairman of the Health and Wellbeing Board.

**RESOLVED:** That the formulation of consultation responses on behalf of the Health and Wellbeing Board to pharmacy applications received from the Thames Valley Primary Care Agency, be delegated to the Consultant in Public Health in consultation with the Chairman of the Health and Wellbeing Board.

## **26. UPDATES FROM BOARD MEMBERS**

Jim Stockley informed the Board that Healthwatch's work with young people continued to go well and that Healthwatch Wokingham Borough had been approached by other schools and Healthwatches.

Beverley Graves indicated that Claire Folan, Policy Officer, would now be supporting the Business, Skills and Enterprise Partnership. She would circulate information on progress made against elements assigned to the Partnership in the Health and Wellbeing Strategy. Beverley Graves also informed the Board of an opportunity to bid for funding.

Andy Couldrick commented that the membership of the Community Safety Partnership had changed a little since the last update. The Partnership had completed the Domestic Homicide Review and was awaiting feedback from the Home Office. It was noted that the Community Safety Partnership was looking at the low level of disability related hate crimes and whether this was due to a low number of incidents or the result of low reporting. The number of burglaries and thefts had improved as had the rate of repeat domestic abuse referrals. Thefts from vehicles were down 40%. While violent offences were up 40% this had been from a very low level. Board members were also informed that the Community Safety Partnership would be responding to proposals from Thames Valley Police regarding police areas.

**RESOLVED:** That the update from Board members be noted.

## **27. PERFORMANCE**

### **28. PERFORMANCE METRICS**

Stuart Rowbotham, Director of Health and Wellbeing presented the Performance Metrics.

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

- Councillor Bray queried what was measured by the performance indicator 'Percentage of report dementia diagnosis.' Dr Zylstra clarified that this referred to diagnosis of dementia against a formula for the area. Typically the better the health of an area, the lower the incidences of dementia.
- Dr Llewellyn commented that the message about measures people could take such as exercise, to prevent dementia, need to be better publicised.
- Dr Zylstra questioned whether the targets were challenging enough as they were all rated green. Stuart Rowbotham stated that some targets had been difficult to achieve.

**RESOVLED:** That the Performance Metrics be noted.

## **29. INTEGRATION**

### **30. BETTER CARE FUND HIGHLIGHT REPORT**

The Board received the Better Care Fund Plan highlight report.

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

- The Section 75 had been signed for the locality.
- With regards to the Health and Social Care Hub, a Project Manager for the Wokingham area had been appointed.
- An advert was out for a single team manager for the integrated short term health & social care team.
- With regards to Domiciliary Care Plus initial meetings had been held with Optalis senior management regarding domiciliary care service being expanded to a 24 hour service.
- The Step Up Step Down service had had a good start although there had not been the level of take up anticipated.
- Good progress was being made with regards to Neighbourhood Clusters. Different models were being looked at and Vitality Partnership would be talking to the GP council as examples of alternative ways of working. Board members were informed that a Community Navigator Co-ordinator had been appointed.
- Dr Zylstra commented that good engagement with the public was required with regards to the Neighbourhood Clusters.
- It was noted that the original budget for the Hospital @ Home service was £639k. The service had started slowly and some of the budget was unspent at present. The model and how the money could be used would be relooked at.
- Dr Winfield questioned whether the £300k allocated to the Wokingham locality for winter resilience was included in the Section 75 and was informed that it was.

**RESOLVED:** That the Better Care Fund Plan highlight report be noted.

## **31. HEALTH & WELLBEING**

### **32. CCG CLUSTER PROFILES**

The Board were updated on the progress of the Clinical Commissioning Group Cluster Profiles and noted the East Cluster, West Cluster and North Cluster profiles.

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

- Board members were reminded that the Neighbourhood Clusters project was part of the wider Better Care Fund and was aimed at primary prevention and self-care.
- The central Public Health Team based in Bracknell had created a Wokingham CCG Locality Profile which was part of the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment. Its aim was to support GP commissioners in identifying the priorities for the local area and to develop their commissioning priorities accordingly. The profile had been further broken down into three separate cluster profiles; East, West and North cluster profiles. Board members were reminded that some of those living in the Borough would not be registered at GP practices situated within the Borough and similarly some people living outside the Borough would be registered at Wokingham Borough GP practices.
- In response to a question from Councillor Bray regarding comparators Darrell Gale commented that it was hoped that these would be included in the next iteration. It

was noted that the East Cluster had a higher prevalence of cancer and the North Cluster a higher prevalence of obesity and smoking.

- Board members requested an update in six months' time.

**RESOLVED:** That the progress of the Cluster Work by Wokingham Borough Council's Public Health Team and the wider Cluster Project Team be noted.

### **33. UPDATE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE APPROACH TO THE HEALTH AND WELLBEING STRATEGY**

Darrell Gale provided an update on the development of the approach to the Health and Wellbeing Strategy.

He outlined the following key milestones:

- The Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) updates would be downloaded in September.
- Health and Wellbeing Strategy priorities would be discussed in September and also at the Board's October meeting.
- Work on structuring the JSNA website and chapter sign off would take place October and November and that the Board would sign off the JSNA in December.
- It was anticipated that Council would approve the final Health and Wellbeing Strategy in February.

**RESOLVED:** That the update on the development of the approach to the Health and Wellbeing Strategy be noted.

### **34. FORWARD PROGRAMME**

The Board considered the Forward Programme 2015/16.

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

- It was proposed that the draft CCG Operating Plan be taken to the Board's February meeting and that the final version be presented at the April meeting.
- Katie Summers suggested that a briefing paper be taken to the Board's September meeting regarding the National Information Board 'Personalised Health and Care 2020' road maps and domains. The Health and Wellbeing Board would oversee the delivery of domains.
- A quarterly progress update on the Emotional Health and Wellbeing Strategy would be provided.

**RESOLVED:** That the Forward Programme 2015/16 be noted.

### **35. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

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

### **36. FEMALE GENITAL MUTILATION**

The Board received an exempt update on Female Genital Mutilation.



**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations set out in Appendix 1 of the report be agreed except recommendation 2 of the report.

**This page is intentionally left blank**

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE  
PLANNING COMMITTEE  
HELD ON 19 AUGUST 2015 FROM 7.00 PM TO 9.05 PM**

**Committee Members Present**

Councillors: Simon Weeks (Chairman), Tim Holton (Vice-Chairman), Chris Bowring, John Kaiser, Bob Pitts, Malcolm Richards, Rachelle Shepherd-DuBey and Wayne Smith

**Officers Present**

Tricia Harcourt, Senior Democratic Services Officer  
Clare Lawrence, Head of Development Management and Regulatory Services  
Chris Easton, Service Manager, Highway Development  
Mary Severin, Borough Solicitor  
Colm Ó Caomhánaigh, Democratic Services Officer

**Case Officers Present**

Christopher Howard, Ashley Smith, David Maguire, Mark Croucher

**24. APOLOGIES**

An apology for absence was submitted from Councillor Chris Singleton.

**25. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 22 July 2015 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman subject to the following amendments:

- under 'Other Councillors Present', add Mark Ashwell;
- under item 20 in the text 'set out in Agenda pages 185 to 120', amend '120' to '202'.

**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.

**26. DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

Councillor Bob Pitts declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Item 33, application F/2015/0525 - Lord Harris Court, Sindlesham on the grounds that he is a member of the Freemasons and the care home is owned by the Royal Masonic Benevolent Institution. He left the meeting during consideration of the matter and did not take part in the vote.

Councillor Bob Pitts declared that, although he had listed Item 34, application F/2014/2768 – GTO, Floral Mile, Bath Road, Hare Hatch, he still had an open mind with regard to the decision.

**27. APPLICATIONS TO BE DEFERRED AND WITHDRAWN ITEMS**

It was noted that:

Item 30 – F/2014/1561 - Land at Old Wokingham Road, Crowthorne was deferred at the request of the applicant as there were some inconsistencies between the information supplied and the plans.

Item 35 – F/2015/0008 – Site D, Elizabeth Road, Wokingham was deferred until the next meeting as some details need to be clarified.

**28. APPLICATION NO. RM/2015/1375 - LAND WEST OF HYDE END ROAD, SHINFIELD**

**Proposal:** Reserved Matters application pursuant to Outline Planning consent VAR/2014/0624 for the erection of 69 dwellings including access roads garages parking spaces open space and landscape treatment of Phase 1a Shinfield West (access within site appearance landscaping layout and scale).

**Applicant:** Bloor Homes, Linden Homes, Bovis Homes and University of Reading

The Committee received and considered a report about this application, set out on Agenda pages 69 to 108.

The Committee was advised that the Members' Update included

- a recommended amendment to condition 2 plan numbers;
- additional landscaping conditions 15 and 16; and
- a recommended amendment to condition 10 re water attenuation.

Nick Paterson-Neild, Agent, spoke in favour of the application.

It was noted that Members had previously visited the site.

Members asked for clarification on parking and road safety issues. Confirmation was given that the architecture was consistent throughout even though there are three different development companies.

It was noted that the Parish Council supported the application.

**RESOLVED:** That application RM/2015/1375 be approved, subject to the conditions set out on Agenda pages 71 to 76 with conditions 2 and 10 amended and additional conditions as set out in the Members' Update.

**29. APPLICATION NO. RM/2015/0630 - LAND NORTH OF LANE END FARM, CUTBUSH LANE, SHINFIELD, READING**

**Proposal:** Reserved Matters application pursuant to Outline Planning Consent O/2009/1027 for the development of phase 1A of proposed Thames Valley Science Park comprising the construction of a gateway building and all associated landscaping and ancillary works plus temporary car parking arrangements – Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale to be considered.

**Applicant:** University of Reading

The Committee received and considered a report about this application, set out on Agenda pages 109 to 174.

The Committee was advised that the Members' Update included

- a recommended amendment to condition 1 plan numbers and condition 5 – approval of materials; and
- other recommended amendments to conditions 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 17 and 20 to remove notes appended to the conditions.

Nick Paterson-Neild, Agent, spoke in favour of the application.

Confirmation was given that the concerns regarding wildlife habitats have been dealt with. Members also asked about the design and connectivity of the cycle paths.

It was noted that the reference in the report to a 20% increase to peak rainfall intensity to allow for climate change should be 30%.

**RESOLVED:** That application RM/2015/0630 be approved, subject to the conditions set out on Agenda pages 111 to 120, with conditions 1, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 17 and 20 amended as set out in the Members' Update.

**30. APPLICATION NO. F/2015/0525 - LORD HARRIS COURT, MOLE ROAD, SINDLESHAM**

**Proposal:** Proposed demolition of existing Class C2 nursing care wing and erection of new Class C2 wing for specialist dementia care alterations to site layout to provide on-site car parking plus landscaping works.

**Applicant:** Marc Nelson Smith

*Councillor Bob Pitts having declared a personal and prejudicial interest left the meeting after hearing the planning officer's report.*

The Committee received and considered a report about this application, set out on Agenda pages 175 to 198.

The Committee was advised that the Members' Update included:

- an additional condition 20 to ensure that the extension is retained as an extra care facility;
- an additional response from the Countryside Officer and subsequently recommended conditions 21 to 23 related to protecting habitats and biodiversity;
- a correction to the number of parking spaces in Paragraph 18 on Agenda page 185 under Highways and parking;
- corrections to the condition numbers referred to in the Consultation Responses and Planning Issues sections of the report.

It was noted that Members visited the site on Friday 14 August 2015 to review the development within the wider context.

Confirmation was given that separation distances and landscaping measures will reduce disturbance to local residents from noise or light pollution.

**RESOLVED:** That application F/2015/0525 be approved, subject to the conditions set out on Agenda pages 176 to 180 with the additional conditions 20 to 23 set out in the Members' Update.

**31. APPLICATION NO. F/2014/2768 - GTO, FLORAL MILE, BATH ROAD, HARE HATCH**

**Proposal:** Proposed demolition of existing buildings and the erection of a two storey extension to existing office building for the service repair and restoration of motor vehicles (Use Class B2) with ancillary accommodation car parking and landscaping.

**Applicant:** GTO Engineering

The Committee received and considered a report about this application set out on Agenda pages 199 to 222.

It was noted that Members visited the site on Friday 14 August 2015 to view the development in the context of the Green Belt. A supporting statement from the applicant was circulated to Members at the site visit and at the meeting.

Jonathan Walton, Agent, spoke in support of the application outlining the economic and social benefits that he believed the development would bring.

Members welcomed the predicted additional employment and the high-skilled nature of the jobs involved. Concern was expressed about the scale of the proposed extension to add over 2,100 sqm of floor space, being 70% of the existing building.

Members asked if this was not a redevelopment given that the company was already operating on the site or if the visual impact could be reduced by landscaping. Planning officials said that the proposal could not be considered to be a redevelopment of the site, given the large extension and increase in volume, and that no amount of screening or landscaping would make the development acceptable as visual impact was not the primary concern in this Green Belt location.

It was noted that if Members overturn the recommendation of the officials on this matter the application will have to be referred to the National Planning Casework Unit.

A proposal to approve the application fell on the Chairman's casting vote.

**RESOLVED:** That application F/2014/2768 be deferred to allow negotiations to take place with the applicant to find a compromise solution. If, as a result of negotiations, officers are minded to support a revised scheme, then it will be brought back to the November Planning Committee for a decision. However, if a compromise has not been agreed by 30 November 2015, the Head of Development Management and Regulatory Services is authorised to refuse the application.

### **32. APPLICATION NO. F/2015/1159 - 4 FROGHALL DRIVE, WOKINGHAM**

**Proposal:** Erection of a two storey side/rear, single storey rear and front extensions to include a new front entrance porch and internal alterations.

**Applicant:** Miss Lawrie

The Committee received and considered a report about this application, set out on Agenda pages 243 to 254.

It was noted that Members visited the site on Friday 14 August 2015 to view the relationship of the proposed extension with the adjoining residential property, 2 Frog Hall Drive.

Jonathan Gilbey spoke objecting to the application on behalf of his mother, resident at 2 Frog Hall Drive.

Craig Lawrie spoke on behalf of the applicant in support of the application.

Members considered the points raised relating to loss of light in the neighbour's conservatory. It was noted that there were large trees on the neighbour's property which were also reducing light.

**RESOLVED:** That application F/2015/1159 be approved, subject to the conditions set out on Agenda pages 243 to 245.

### **33. PRE COMMITTEE SITE VISITS**

The Head of Development Management and Regulatory Services had recommended that pre-Committee site visits be undertaken in respect of the following applications:

- F/2015/1336 – Land adjacent to Remenham Place (Arcadian Waters), Remenham Hill, Remenham – one dwelling in the green belt, to view the site in the context of the green belt.
- F/2015/0767 – Hill Farm, Jouldings Lane, Farley Hill – proposed bio-gas anaerobic digestion plan, to view the site in the context of the character of the area and proximity to other land uses.

**Resolved:** That pre-Committee site visits be undertaken on Friday 11 September 2015 in respect of the following applications:

- F/2015/1336 – Land adjacent to Remenham Place (Arcadian Waters), Remenham Hill, Remenham – one dwelling in the green belt. The site visit would enable Members to view the site in the context of the green belt.
- F/2015/0767 – Hill Farm, Jouldings Lane, Farley Hill – proposed bio-gas anaerobic digestion plan. The site visit would enable Members to view the site in the context of the character of the area and proximity to other land uses.

A site visit agreed at the 29 April meeting in respect of:  
F/2015/0430 – Pine Platt, Heath Ride, Finchampstead  
which was not carried out, will now be undertaken on 11 September 2015.

**This page is intentionally left blank**