

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF  
THE EXECUTIVE  
HELD ON 31 MARCH 2016 FROM 7.30 PM TO 8.45 PM**

**Committee Members Present**

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

**Other Councillors Present**

Mark Ashwell  
Prue Bray  
Norman Jorgensen  
Malcolm Richards

**118. APOLOGIES**

There were no apologies for absence received.

**119. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Minutes of the meeting of the Executive held on 18 February 2016 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

Councillor Philip Mirfin advised the meeting that he wished to apologise to Mr Humphreys regarding comments made at the previous meeting as he had since found out that a civic centre had been planned.

**120. DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

Councillor Pauline Jorgensen declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 115, 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.

Councillor Anthony Pollock declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 115, 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.

**121. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

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

**121.1 Chas Hockin asked the Executive Member for Planning and Highways the following question:**

Bearing in mind the error in stating the reason for raising the car park charges, what confidence do I have in knowing that the council has made an accurate estimate of the numbers of people parking their cars in council car parks in the evenings and weekends? What figures did they use, how did they go about the assessment etc. I would like to see the figures that were used. (I am not against raising charges, but I am against raising charges in the evenings).

## **Answer**

An evening and Sunday parking survey was carried out in late February 2016, which counted the usage of each of the car parks on a 2 hourly basis from 7pm-11pm Saturday evening and 6am-6pm on Sunday. The data was used to estimate the income from the proposed charges.

Evening charging is based on 10% of the average daily usage and Sunday charging is based on 50% of the average daily usage. Inevitably any income forecasts are an estimate as we cannot always accurately predict how users will respond. However from our experience of other charging changes we reflect that by putting in an element of resistance normally in our forecasts of around 10%.

## **Supplementary Question**

Bearing in mind that in the responses listed to the objections you mentioned several issues and these are all cost related. You talk about the introduction of Parking Enforcement Officers, surely that is going to be a cost that will negate any profit that you make from raising the charges. Then you talk about on-street parking enforcement, that is obviously going to involve a cost to the detriment of any profit that you are going to make.

From my own personal aspect I think you have underestimated the social impact that you are going to have on raising these charges. I use the Woodley Town Council Oakwood Centre and we get on very well with the Council there. I am a member of the Woodley Photographic Club and increasing the charges, not only with us but for other clubs, could have a detrimental effect on our usage of the premises and the attendance that we get. So I would like you to reconsider your proposal to introduce evening and Sunday charges and make it an increase in the daily rate.

## **Supplementary Answer**

I understand what you are saying Mr Hockin. I have a number of other questions to answer and one of them does involve the car park in Woodley.

We have to make some pretty difficult decisions because of the cuts that we have had to take into the Council. We have had a large number of responses to the consultation and if somebody comes up with something that could supplement that or replace that income that we are likely to lose going forward we would always listen to it and I think you will hear as I answer some of the other questions that we have listened to the consultation and so I would ask you to bear with me and listen to the other questions.

## **121.2 Richard Dolinski asked the Executive Member for Planning and Highways the following question:**

Woodley Town Council, The Town Centre Management Initiative (TCMI) and local business owners are very concerned that introducing a flat rate fee of £1 for Sundays and after 6pm in the evening will not achieve the additional income required from Woodley's car parks to balance WBC's books and deter visitors to the town centre. Recognising that additional income is required the Town Council and the TCMI suggested in its consultation response that it would be better to increase the hourly parking charge that has been frozen for many years under a Conservative led council from 70p an hour to 80p. This has multiple benefits in that the income from this approach would be extremely higher than the new evening and Sunday charges and is more acceptable to Woodley residents and businesses and demonstrates you have acted upon a consultation response. Would the lead Member support this for Woodley, in consideration of the concerns of businesses and

the fear of those living in the town centre that drivers would simply park in residential roads?

**Answer**

An evening and Sunday parking survey was carried out in late February 2016, which counted the usage of each car park on a 2 hourly basis from 7pm-11pm Saturday evenings and 6am-6pm on Sundays. This data was used to estimate the income from the proposed charges and this was then compared with an estimate of income from increasing the hourly charge by 10p. The data showed that the evening and Sunday charges are most likely to increase revenue beyond what would be raised by increasing the hourly charge by 10p.

However I understand that there is an opportunity to be flexible about the car park charging regime across the Borough and there is no specific reason for absolute consistency in the charging structure; horses for courses basically. On this basis I am prepared to trial an increase in hourly charging in Woodley car parks in lieu of the evening and Sunday charging.

We will monitor this over the next 12 months and compare it with the income generated in other areas with a view to reviewing the overall charging regime at the end of the 2016/17 financial year.

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

I wish to draw the attention of the Lead Member (and indeed the whole Executive) to the lack of any concrete recommendations to improve parking at Twyford Station, this is in the report that you are meant to be receiving later in this meeting where CrossRail services, at Twyford added to those from GWR, are going to provide increased passenger traffic and car parking needs. The report, as far as Twyford is concerned, only offers a proposal to appoint external consultants to review a Park and Ride possibility. The Executive needs to be aware that GWR has changed its mind since October 2015 when there was a meeting at Windsor Guildhall facilitated by the Royal Borough where GWR CEO claimed there were no plans, at that stage, to improve facilities at Twyford. That was vigorously contested by WUG, the Wargrave Train User Group which I lead, with generous support from Theresa May our MP. Earlier this month, however, Mark Hopwood changed his mind and publicly declared the need for improved car parking at Twyford and this was prominently reported in the Twyford Advertiser. However reading the report I feel that Wokingham Borough Council does not appear to be engaged in this change of plan.

Will the Lead Member therefore please clarify, especially given the extra time that has been given for him and the Executive to digest this report which was published over two months ago, just where the Borough stands in facilitating the provision of significantly improved car parking at Twyford Station?

**Answer**

The Council has had discussions with both the operator (GWR) and Network Rail about the issues of parking at Twyford Station. All parties are well aware of the pressure on the site and the desire for more parking to be made available. The Council was supportive of a bid by GWR for government funding to increase the size of the station car park but this bid was not successful. As stated in the question there is a proposal for a very limited increase

in spaces at the station car park and this is currently being considered by Officers. This is an additional 40 spaces that we are looking at the moment in conjunction with GWR.

The site of the station in Twyford means there are limited opportunities to provide additional parking other than the station car park itself. The station and its car park are operated by GWR and as such the form of the car park and how it is operated are outside our control. We will continue to work with the operator to develop options but there are no immediate plans for any significant increase in the number of spaces at Twyford station.

We do however have plans for significantly improving the bus service from Twyford to Wokingham and this will offer some commuters a viable alternative option to travel to and from the station and may help reduce the pressure on the car park.

I do have some other information to impart but before I do that would you like to ask your supplementary?

### **Supplementary Question**

It would appear that your remarks do not take into account the latest moves by GWR for a one or two-deck car park. This is what I surmise from what you said and I think that needs to be brought up to date. I think it would have had more credibility for me in your reply if you had mentioned that Wokingham station, and its car park which was revamped two years ago, was done under the NSIQ (National Station Improvement Programme run by Network Rail) and that is not mentioned in the report at all.

Councillor Kaiser and the Executive I think need to take note that the reports only recommendation for improving car parking at Wargrave station is, and I express it after careful thought, absurd. Page 50 of the agenda and paragraph 11.32 refer. The double yellow lines at the junction of Station Road and Watermans Way which the report considers should be removed and would permit, I suggest, about six extra spaces were installed about 10 years ago to permit boat delivery vehicles to access and leave Bushnells Marina safely and avoid the junction being blocked by parked vehicles.

With the Lead Member confirm the absurd recommendation to remove the double yellow lines will be ignored?

Keith Baker confirmed as follows: Those are the recommendations of the Task and Finish Group, that was sporn from one of our scrutiny committees, and we will be looking at those and deciding whether they are appropriate or not so your comment on the double yellow line we will be looking at whether it is appropriate or not.

### **Supplementary Answer**

We do have a meeting tomorrow with GWR and we will be speaking to them about their plans around the station car park. I am not quite sure whether they will double deck that car park because they have only got another two years, I believe, to run on the franchise so they may not see that investment coming forward from them. When, if, they are successful winning the franchise then I expect they will.

There are other solutions at Twyford which do involve discussions with some of the local people and that is something that we will be taking forward.

The other thing we will be doing as well, and Keith has made reference to it, is we are implementing civil parking enforcement next year and as part of that process we will

actually look at all the traffic orders that we have got out there to ensure that they are sensible, that they meet the latest regulations and that is why it takes nearly two years to get civil parking enforcement completed.

With regards to Twyford it is something we are concerned about, we see Crossrail 2019 coming forward, and it is something we are in constant discussion with them over.

I cannot say any more than that but we are currently looking at something a lot wider than would be apparent to anybody looking at this report.

**121.4 Peter Must asked the Executive Member for Planning and Highways the following question:**

The objections raised to the introduction of a £1 charge for evening, Sunday and Bank holiday use of Council car parks must be unique in coming from every sector of the local community: commercial and retail businesses, stall holders, events organisers, disability groups, heritage organisations and residents; leaving one to wonder what it takes, in a month where the Chancellor of the Exchequer has abandoned proposed cuts to PIPs because of public discontent, for the public of this Borough to persuade the Council not to proceed with a measure that is so widely opposed, so can Councillors please listen to the people and find some other means to raise this revenue?

Since you say if you can come up with any other suggestions please let us know can I assume that you will actually be allowing time before the implementation of these proposals if you do go ahead for those suggestions to come forward?

**Answer**

We did receive around 400 responses to the proposals for introducing evening and weekend parking and the vast majority were opposed to the introduction of charges and very few did suggest an alternative as we have seen for Woodley who did come forward with an alternative. All of these responses were read, and we did read all 400 of them, and considered in light of the pressure on the Council to find additional income and make savings.

All car parking income is used to fund the upkeep and improvement of the Council's road network. The cost of this service is largely dependent upon the cost of materials used, and of course they have all gone up in cost but the main is the cuts that we are actually enjoying; I guess you could describe it as that from the Government. Without finding additional income there are services that we would have to cut and those services would fall in a lot of cases on the weaker section of the population and would lead to a deterioration of the Borough's road network.

I did not come into this job to put up the prices, I am a Conservative, and I did not come into this to cut services to the most vulnerable. We are placed in a fairly difficult situation but I will take your recommendation away and discuss that with my colleagues with regards to what we do but please understand every month that ticks by means that money is not available for us to spend on the most vulnerable people who are in the Borough.

**Supplementary Question**

Can we be quite clear whether it is £1 for the limits of parking whether it is two hours or three hours that are normally imposed which is what I have been told by the Regeneration Team that a £1 will buy you two hours or three hours or whether it is a £1 for the whole

period between the normal closure of the day time regime or the Sunday regime? Is it just £1 for the whole period or is it £1 for three hours, four hours or two hours?

### **Supplementary Answer**

I am told it is £1 for the whole thing.

### **121.5 Keith Malvern asked the Executive Member for Planning and Highways the following question:**

The Vision for the Borough is 'a great place to live, an even better place to do business' and that is followed in the Vision by needing to facilitate the regeneration of our towns. When Wokingham Town Council made their comments on the proposed parking charges they believed that '...with the regeneration of the town under way, this is not the right time to implement additional (parking) charges'.

Recognising that these proposed charges would have an impact on the regeneration what discussions have you had with Executive Member for Regeneration and the Regeneration Team about this?

### **Answer**

The Regeneration Team and the Highways Team have to work very closely together, they work glove in hand as you can probably imagine and I am told by Matt Davey in Highways that he has spoken to the Head of Regeneration and he does not believe that this will have any impact on the regeneration of the town. In fact it would have a lot less impact than putting up the overall prices because of course the bulk of the business in the town is done during the day.

The regeneration of Wokingham Town will make it a more attractive destination and it is expected visitors will spend more time in the town during the day, at weekends and in the evenings. Daytime car parking charges in Wokingham Town have remained unchanged for several years and the day time charges again will remain unchanged this year. On balance the Council believes that the very small charge for parking all night and all day on Sunday will not have a negative impact on the attractiveness of the town as a destination.

### **Supplementary Question**

Can I start by referring to your goodself as the Leader of the Council. You have said that "it is with deep regret that the Council has been forced to make these proposals". I would like to reassure yourself the Council has decided to make these proposals nobody has forced you to do it.

The advantage of any consultation, and we have had a consultation that has already been referred to with more than 400 responses, is that you are able to explain why you need it and you are able to explain what the likely revenue will be. This is somewhat difficult as you have explained today you have only recently done a survey of usage on Sundays. Never mind we move on. What alternatives have been considered and what can you see coming down the track?

Nowhere in the consultation document will you read anything about what alternatives have been considered. For example: trying to find more space in existing car parks particularly popular ones; increasing the current charges which have been referred to; increasing the subsidised charges for staff and Councillors and marketing initiatives. Luckily you have had some good feedback from hundreds of customers who have given their time freely to

suggest alternatives; even I have suggested alternatives to you including the ones I have just mentioned. I will ask you whether you will take this opportunity to defer these charges. You referred to something happening in Woodley, but I couldn't hear what you were saying because you do not speak loudly enough. Whether you want to defer these Wokingham changes until at least after the Station car park development has been completed and use the time to have a proper look at the helpful customer feedback you have already had?

### **Supplementary Answer**

I would just reiterate that every minute, every hour, every day that goes by where we don't make these charges it puts huge pressures on other services in the Council and some of these services fall on the most vulnerable people in the Borough and as I said I did not come in to carry this role out either to increase prices or to take services away from the most vulnerable in the Borough.

Somewhere we have to decide that prices go up. I am sure Keith would like to tell you about the six months we spent talking about the budget at our Group meetings, examining everything even in micro detail and I would suggest that this is one of the things we need to do to generate the income to make sure the fabric of our roads continue to at least not deteriorate more than they have already.

The Leader of Council stated the following: The one comment I would say to you in terms of our pressure is just take Adult Social Care, which I am sure every one of us does not want to have reduced. Our growth just to stand still for next year is £2.4m. Put that in context 2% council tax rise is £1.6m so we still have to find £800k just to stand still so a contribution for this for repairing potholes etc has to be the way forward.

### **122. MEMBER QUESTION TIME**

There were no Member questions submitted.

### **123. REPORT OF THE COMMUTER PARKING TASK AND FINISH GROUP**

The Executive considered a report setting out the management response to the recommendations from the Commuter Parking Task and Finish Group following its review into the problem of commuter parking on residential streets.

Norman Jorgensen, Chairman of the Community and Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee, provided some background to the report and stated that the Committee appreciated that there would not be the resources available to deal with all the recommendations immediately. The expectation was that the Executive would develop a plan to review the recommendations and that was the outcome the Committee was hoping for.

Councillor Jorgensen did however feel that some of the recommendations could be taken forward quickly including: working with rail companies to further improve cycle storage at stations; the opportunity to introduce buses to take people to and from Twyford station; the promotion of wider discussions and action regarding car parking and bus access to Twyford Station; and consideration of the creation of a car park on land on the Woodley side of Earley Station using sustainable travel CIL or S106 contributions.

The Executive Member for Planning and Highways commented that the Council had built a number of park and rides and were intending to continue to expand those and one of his ambitions was to look at multi-destination park and rides which would take people to and from stations. Consideration was also being given to improving turning circles at stations

in order that the buses could serve the stations. Councillor Kaiser felt it was an excellent report but wanted to reiterate that, in the context of the savings that the Council had to make, some of the recommendations may be challenging. A programme would be put together over the next 3-4 months to address them.

The Leader of Council felt it would be helpful if the Community and Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee could put the recommendations into a priority order as any plan for future work would need to concentrate on the high priority items first and asked that the Chairman take this back to the Committee.

Following a query by Councillor Pollock it was confirmed that, with the advent of Crossrail, it was expected that usage of Twyford Station would increase by around 15% and therefore it was recognised that car parking would be a growing problem and there were alternatives that would be explored.

Because the majority of future development will be happening in the south of the Borough and consideration needs to be given to the provision of access to Wokingham town centre the Executive Member for Environment felt that the report didn't refer to the initiatives for providing a transport interchange at Wokingham Station and the high quality buses in the area. The report also seemed to suggest that train users were only going to London whereas on the Waterloo line people were travelling to other stations. Consequently all destinations, times and capacity should be considered and addressed.

**RESOLVED:** That the report of the Community and Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee's Commuter Parking Task and Finish Group be noted and its recommendations be accepted.

#### **124. EVENING, SUNDAY AND SHUTE END CHARGES**

The Executive considered a report setting out proposed Sunday and evening car parking charges which will ensure that the Council's off street car parks generate additional income and bring the Wokingham car park charging regime into line with many other authorities locally.

The Executive Member for Planning and Highways advised the meeting that the purpose of the report was to give authority to put the traffic orders in place to enable the implementation of the evening, Sunday and Shute End charges. Councillor Kaiser reminded Members that he had stated earlier in the meeting that the Council would be looking at variations to the proposals and would be mindful of suggestions put forward. He reiterated the financial difficulties the Council was facing which had been one of the reasons the proposals were necessary.

As set out in the report it was clarified that the proposals were for a £1.00 charge for parking all day (8am-6pm) on Sundays and bank holidays and Monday to Sunday nights (6pm-8am).

Councillor Mirfin queried when it was planned to have pay on exit at Council car parks and signage at the entrances to all the Borough's towns to show the availability of spaces? Councillor Kaiser stated that consideration would be given to these proposals; however financial implications also had to be considered. Councillor Pauline Jorgensen however requested assurance that the Council would not be spending more on car park barriers than was being made from car parking. A number of councils already used "RingGo" (a

cashless parking solution) and that system, in conjunction with spot enforcement, could save money on capital outlay.

**RESOLVED** That:

- 1) approval be given to the permanent making of The Wokingham Borough Council (Various Off-Street Borough Car Parks) (Variation (2)) Order 2016);
- 2) Officers be instructed to amend signage and equipment in the car parks;
- 3) those who have responded to the consultation be informed accordingly.

**125. SHINFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

The Executive considered a report setting out a proposed Shinfield Neighbourhood Plan which had been updated by the Parish Council following consultation responses to the pre-submission draft plan.

The Executive Member for Planning and Highways advised Members that Officers had been working very closely with Shinfield Parish Council to produce a Neighbourhood Plan that was aligned to the Council's own policies and guidelines and the intention was for the Plan to go through a formal 6 week consultation. In addition the Council would begin the process of appointing an examiner to examine the Plan in public.

Members congratulated Shinfield Parish Council on their hard work over a long period of time to produce the Neighbourhood Plan which was the first one that had come before the Executive.

It was noted that the production of the Neighbourhood Plan was funded from grants and would not cost council tax payers any money.

**RESOLVED** That:

- 1) a 6 week consultation for the draft Neighbourhood Plan be approved; and
- 2) the Council begin to appoint an examiner to examine the Shinfield Neighbourhood Plan.

**126. SDL COMMUNITY FACILITY, SHINFIELD**

The Executive considered a report proposing the utilisation of S106 contributions from developers to jointly deliver with Shinfield Parish Council a community facility on the former Royal British Legion site in Shinfield.

Members were advised that Shinfield Parish Council had worked with developers to develop their own district centre which would be delivered jointly with Wokingham Borough Council and this was a really good example that could be replicated by other areas in the Borough.

It was noted that the interest costs would be funded by the reserve for infrastructure 'bridging loans' and realistically it was likely that the scheme would not commence until 2017/18 therefore the borrowing costs were likely to be £23k.

Councillor Haitham Taylor congratulated Shinfield Parish Council on the work they had undertaken to buy the Royal British Legion site in order to progress this proposal and to get contributions from the developer in order to put the new community centre in a place

that was much better suited than was originally proposed and produce a design that would much better suit the community.

**RESOLVED** That:

- 1) the utilisation of the following S106 contributions from developers on the community facility jointly delivered by Wokingham Borough Council and Shinfield Parish Council on the former Royal British Legion site in Shinfield be agreed:
  - (a) £1,136,000 from the S106 funds for community facilities in the SM4 development area; and
  - (b) up to £1,000,000 from the S106 fund for leisure and community facilities in the SM4 development area.
- 2) the Director of Finance and Resources be authorised to forward fund the scheme through borrowing;
- 3) it be noted that the interest costs will be funded by the reserve for infrastructure 'bridging loans' if it cannot be accommodated within existing Treasury Management budgets. The borrowing costs are estimated to be £75K if the scheme is commenced in 2016/17 or £23K if the scheme is commenced in 2017/18.

**127. COUNCIL OWNED COMPANIES' BUSINESS**

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

The Executive considered a report setting out the budget monitoring position for the month ending 31 January 2016 and the operational update for the period to 29 February 2016.

The Leader of Council highlighted a number of areas in the report including the business opportunities that Optalis was currently pursuing or had actually been successful in acquiring which showed how successful the company had become. In particular the number of other local authorities who were wishing to work with Optalis was noted.

In relation to WHL the two key areas were Phoenix, which should have its ground work put in shortly, and Fosters which had now been let and therefore work should start on site next month.

**RESOLVED** That:

- 1) the budget monitoring position for the month ending 31 January 2016 be noted; and
- 2) the operational update for the period to 29 February 2016 be noted.

**128. COUNCIL POLICY ON ACADEMIES**

The Executive considered a report setting out a provisional policy stance on academies in response to proposals that were due to be included in the forthcoming Education and Adoptions Bill.

The Executive Member for Children's Services provided background to the proposed policy which had come about because of a number of changes coming forward including that central Government was proposing that all schools move to academies by 2020-2022 and the requirements of the Education and Adoption Bill. In addition a consultation had been launched on the school funding formula which was proposing changing how schools

would receive their funding including whether they would get this directly rather than through the designated schools grant.

Currently there were only 9 out of 65 schools in the Borough which were academies which although a small proportion of schools actually accounted for 32% of pupils and this would increase to 40% as there were two more academies opening in September.

Councillor Haitham Taylor explained that currently a number of schools had licensed deficits, which meant that they were spending more than they had in their budgets and therefore it was proposed to change the licensed deficits into loans which would make the Council's position more secure in the longer term. There would be significant financial challenges in moving schools to academies. As the overall financial and resource implications of the proposed changes were still unclear at the present time a further report would be brought back when these were known.

Because of the amount of work involved in this project the Leader of Council asked Councillor Haitham Taylor to consider setting up a Member task and finish group to assist with the workload.

**RESOLVED** That:

- 1) the provisional policy stance on academies proposed in the report be adopted, and particularly the proposal to change any school's licensed deficit to a loan;
- 2) Officers be instructed to continue related discussions with the Department for Education;
- 3) associated dialogue with schools and other stakeholders reflecting schools' autonomous decision-making and current interest be maintained;
- 4) consideration be given to the setting up of a Member task and finish working group to progress issues relating to the Policy.

**129. SHARED BUILDING CONTROL SERVICES**

The Executive considered a report setting out proposals for the creation of a 3-way Shared Building Control Service between Wokingham Borough Council, The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead and West Berkshire District Council.

Members were advised by the Executive Member for Resident Services that the intention was to extend the current Shared Building Control Service to include West Berkshire District Council following the successful arrangement with Windsor and Maidenhead. Although there would not be great financial benefits to the Council the proposal would give the opportunity to develop skills and enhance the ability to sell the services that Building Control already provides. It would also provide greater resilience to the service.

Following a query by the Leader of Council in relating to monitoring the savings from the Shared Service Councillor Jorgensen responded that a report would be brought to Executive in due course on proposals for how the Council could generate further income from the Service.

**RESOLVED** That:

- 1) the creation of a 3-way Shared Building Control Service to commence in Summer 2016 between Wokingham Borough Council, The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead (RBWM) and West Berkshire District Council (WBDC) be approved;
- 2) authority be delegated to the Director of Environment/Director of Finance and Resources and Executive Member for Resident Services to sign the legal agreement to enter into the 3-way shared service;
- 3) the Council should work together with the other members of the shared service during the early stages of the shared service arrangement to consider opportunities for an alternative longer-term model for Building Control Services to further enable all parties to realise opportunities for profit to be generated and returned to these organisations;
- 4) the Building Control Shared Service Joint Board (Building Control Board) be established to oversee the strategic leadership of the Building Control Shared Service and that the Executive Member responsible for this area be appointed to this Board and authorised to make decisions on behalf of the Council about the Building Control Shared Service.

**130. EXTENSION OF HEALTH VISITING, FAMILY NURSE PARTNERSHIP (FNP) AND SCHOOL NURSING**

The Executive considered a report which proposed an extension of the existing provision of Health Visiting, Family Nurse Partnership (FNP) and School Nursing to enable a full re-modelling of the 0-19 service offering.

The Executive Member for Health and Wellbeing advised that an extension to the existing contract was being proposed which was within budget and would allow more time to negotiate a formal contract.

**RESOLVED:** That both a 6 and potential 12 month extension be accepted of the Health Visiting, School Nursing and Family Nurse Partnership service, giving a new expiry date of either April or September 2017, this will allow a period of time to work on the integration plans jointly; Public Health, Children's Services and key stakeholders, both extension times have been requested to ensure that the integration is fully completed.

**131. MODEL FOR COMMUNITY ASSET TRANSFERS**

The Executive considered a report setting out the Heads of Terms to be used under the Model for Community Asset Transfers.

Councillor Mark Ashwell, Deputy Executive Member for Regeneration and Communities, advised the meeting that a review of all £700m worth of Council assets was taking place and during this review a number of opportunities to transfer assets to towns, parishes and community organisations had been identified. Members were reminded that the Executive had previously agreed a set of proposals for developing a process to fast track community asset transfers. Following consideration by a Task and Finish Group terms and conditions by which community assets would be transferred was developed. The proposed model would be transparent, consistent and equitable.

Councillor Ashwell highlighted a number of clauses within the Heads of Terms including that leases up to 30 years could be provided which would enable grants to be applied for. It was noted that this would not prevent leases of over 30 years being provided if

appropriate as this could be agreed by the Executive. There would also be break clauses for both parties and opportunities for a no rent/shared profit option.

**RESOLVED:** That the Heads of Terms to be used under the Model for Community Asset Transfer, as developed by the Member Task and Finish Group, be approved.

This page is intentionally left blank