

CABINET

THURSDAY, 23 NOVEMBER 2017

PRESENT: Councillors Simon Dudley (Chairman), Phillip Bicknell, Natasha Airey, MJ Saunders, Samantha Rayner, Jack Rankin, David Evans, Stuart Carroll

Principal Members also in attendance: Lisa Targowska, David Hilton, Christine Bateson and Ross McWilliams

Officers: Rob Stubbs, Louisa Dean, Mary Kilner, Russell O'Keefe, Kevin McDaniel, Karen Shepherd, Anna Robinson, Andy Jeffs and Hilary Hall

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Cox and Coppinger

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Dudley declared Personal Interests in the questions from Holyport pupils and the items 'Delivering New School Places for the BLP' and 'Local Area SEND Written Statement of Actions,' as a founder and Chair of Governors of Holyport College and Chair of Governors at Riverside Primary. He stepped down from the Chair, remained in the room but took no part in the discussion or voting on the items.

Councillor Bicknell declared a Personal Interest as his son worked at Holyport College.

MINUTES

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That:

- i) The Part I minutes of the meeting held on 26 October 2017 be approved.**
- ii) The Part I minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet Regeneration Sub Committee held on 26 October 2017 be noted**

APPOINTMENTS

None

ORDER OF BUSINESS

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the order of business, as detailed in the agenda, be varied.

QUESTIONS FROM HOLYPORT COLLEGE STUDENTS

Cabinet received question from pupils at Holyport College. Councillor Bicknell assumed the Chair for this item.

James Erridge asked the following question:

The road outside the College is potentially dangerous for students. How can we persuade the Council to put up a Zebra Crossing and/or traffic lights outside the main entrance?

Councillor Bicknell responded that the volume of pupils attending Holyport College who walked to and from school was relatively low. This was reflected in the School Travel Plan and the operating arrangements which were in place and was based on all staff and pupils arriving by transport, hence mini buses were in place to provide safe access to and from school. The travel plan was monitored on an annual basis, including a survey of pupils and staff. Any issues arising could be advised to the Royal Borough who were very willing to discuss these with the College.

In addition, the Royal Borough encouraged walking and had a programme of works, and education programmes, to create and encourage safe walking routes. There was no continuous walking route on either side of Ascot Road and it was not straightforward to build the additional lengths of footway which would be required. In addition, there was no street lighting in the area which would be required to create a fully safe route for pedestrians during the winter months and darker evenings.

A pedestrian crossing would be required in two locations (adjacent to the school and in the vicinity of Holyport Green) to ensure that residential areas were linked into the school. Whilst this could be delivered the urbanising impact of the crossing at all times combined with the low levels of use would require careful consideration prior to progressing. There was nothing to stop the school putting together a petition about the issue.

By way of a supplementary question, James Erridge asked how much it would cost?

Councillor Bicknell confirmed that the total cost would be in the region of £0.5m.

Kai Sankowski asked the following question:

How might the council improve street lighting in Holyport Village and in the vicinity of the College?

Councillor Bicknell responded that Holyport Green was a conservation area with limited street lighting. The current policy was to minimise urbanisation by not installing additional street lighting around Holyport Green or in the vicinity of the college. Street lighting was in place in residential areas and at road junctions for road safety purposes. The introduction of street lighting would require approval and engagement with the Parish Council and a shift from current practice and policy.

Chenzira Gwenzi asked the following question:

Bus fares to Maidenhead from Holyport are almost £4 for a single. What could the Council do to reduce this and what can the Council do to provide more regular bus services to both Maidenhead & Windsor?

Councillor Bicknell responded that the Royal Borough did not directly operate local bus services but did work closely with operators (for example: Courtney Buses and First Bus) to provide and promote bus services which served the community. Subsidy was available to develop new routes, or support existing routes which were

not commercially viable. Support was targeted at gaps in the market or areas of potential demand to ensure that funding delivered a return on investment.

Indicative costs to operate one bus for a working day were approximately £120,000. Therefore, greater value for money could be achieved by developing, supporting and improving existing routes to meet demand. Regular meetings and dialogue were in place with bus operators to deliver improvements and meet the Royal Borough's commitment to improve public transport.

One way of supporting services and encourage use was to offer discounted child fares, subsidised travel, reward schemes, discounted season tickets and electronic, contactless payment options which reduced cost. The Royal Borough was very happy to take this forward with bus operators. The annual review of the School Travel Plan may also identify needs or concerns which could be considered in discussions between Holyport College and the Royal Borough.

Max Ticehurst asked the following question:

Traffic is often speeding outside the College. What is the Council doing to address this problem?

Councillor Bicknell responded that the Royal Borough had an excellent road safety record and invested annually in road safety measures and training and education programmes. In parallel with a majority of schools, there was a 20mph zone outside Holyport College which operated at school times and was visible by the presence of flashing lights / signs. In addition, the Royal Borough deployed speed indicator devices at various locations which were triggered by vehicles exceeding the speed limit and flashed a warning message or displayed the actual vehicle speed to encourage motorists to slow down.

These measures could be supplemented by speed enforcement delivered by Thames Valley Police or through community Speedwatch schemes where local groups were trained to operate mobile speed cameras, collect details of offending vehicles and forward to the police to contact the vehicle owner. Speedwatch schemes and the deployment of Speed Indicator Devices offered effective and deliverable measures which offered an immediate visual deterrent and engaged with the local community.

Saamiya Usmani asked the following question:

Holyport College is growing and currently lacks a school library and also needs more indoor sports facilities. What can the Council do to help facilitate this?

Councillor N. Airey responded that Holyport College was designed and built by the Education and Skills agency to provide education for 500 pupils. When the Council, in its role as the Planning Authority, granted planning permission for the school, these matters were considered and the College proposition was considered by the EFSA to be acceptable in terms of curriculum delivery. For the planning authority, if this position had changed any applications coming forward in a Green Belt location should be supported by evidence to justify the need for new facilities above and beyond what was originally considered by the College to meet their needs.

From an education perspective, Holyport College was an Academy and could make bids to the Condition Improvement Fund run by the Education and Skills Funding

Agency. According to the ESFA ;The core priority for CIF is to address significant condition need. CIF also supports a small proportion of expansion projects. These are for Ofsted-rated good or outstanding academies and sixth-form colleges that need to expand their existing facilities and/or floor space'. The Council had no authority over CIF decisions of the EFSA but would support any application the college chose to make.

By way of a supplementary question, Saamiya Usmani asked if the school undertook fundraising, would the council be prepared to match fund?

Councillor N Airey responded that later in the agenda was a report detailing the need for school spaces across the borough for the next 20 years. The council did not currently undertake match funding. The council had to ensure that places were available in the right place to meet demand. The council wished to support Good and Outstanding schools and would be happy to talk to all schools in the borough to ensure the right places and facilities were available.

Carys Ellis asked the following question:

The price of housing in Maidenhead is amongst the highest in the UK. What is the council doing to build affordable housing for young people? (either to rent or buy)

Councillor McWilliams responded that this was a serious issue in the UK. Many young people under 30 years old had no hope of being able to buy their own home. More people in the country owned their home outright than had a mortgage, leading to a housing affordability crisis. The Chancellor had just announced a budget of £44bn including a reduction in stamp duty for first time buyers. Central government had to be the driving force because it was a nationwide problem. However there were things the council could do locally. The Borough Local Plan included a commitment to build 100% of the Objectively Assessed Need for housing, to meet demand and reduce prices. The BLP set a threshold of 30% affordable housing, which included a variety of products such as Affordable Rent, Shared Ownership, Help to Buy and social housing.

By way of a supplementary question, Carys Ellis asked how did developers wiggle out of their obligation to deliver affordable housing and what was the council doing to address this problem?

Councillor McWilliams responded that the situation was incredibly frustrating for the council. Developers would argue the costs of a development meant it would be unviable if affordable housing was included. The Chancellor was undertaking a review of land banking and if there was evidence this had occurred, the government would act via the HCA. The council would continue to work with local developers and be robust on its own policy position. Joint venture sites owned by the council in the town centre and the golf club would include 30% affordable housing.

Temi Animashaun asked the following question:

As the College grows and we gain a Year 13 next year there will be pressure for sixth formers to be able to drive to College. What could be done to increase car parking space at college and to expand the land available to the College?

Councillor N. Airey responded that the council had a role as education and planning authority. The original scheme for the school in this location, as proposed by the

applicant, addressed the demand for parking and this was covered in a Transport Assessment. Parking had been provided on site in accordance with the conditions imposed on the planning consent, which included a consideration for student parking. The school was encouraged to factor in any changes into the School Travel Plan. As with many councils, space was a challenge. If additional land was required and available, the council's property team could assist with negotiations with the landowner. However due to the location of the school within the Green Belt a case for very special circumstances would be required to justify this use so a real focus on the use of sustainable modes of travel was needed. Innovative options such as car-sharing should be considered. The borough could support the school in looking at how other schools dealt with the issue.

By way of a supplementary question, Temi Animashaun asked how much the land would cost to buy and would the government take into consideration that there were boarders at the school?

Councillor N. Airey responded that the land was privately owned and was likely to be expensive. The school may need to look at alternative models for quick wins. The government would need to see very special circumstances and education need was likely to take precedence over parking.

Councillor Bicknell commented that land in the centre of Windsor could cost £4m an acre.

Hugo Walsh asked the following question:

Given the proposed development of the golf course what are the Council's plans to preserve Maidenhead's open green spaces and to protect local wildlife?

Councillor S Rayner responded that the council had a very important role as a landowner and as planning authority. Any application for the golf course would be considered under the National Planning Policy Framework, which defined what constituted an open space and contained policy to protect that open space. This would be the starting point for the planning authority in making decisions on any proposals which resulted in the loss of, or provision of, open space. The vision for the site included maintaining or enhancing over 7 hectares and the habitats used by protected or notable species. Open space was also important for the health and mental well-being of residents.

By way of a supplementary question, Hugo Walsh asked what problems could arise with the current wildlife affecting residents?

Councillor S. Rayner responded that the wildlife was likely to adapt to the situation during and after the development works took place.

Lucas Basford asked the following question:

Given that Holyport has been recognised as an outstanding school in its last Ofsted report, what plans are there to increase the number of school places at Holyport and at similar schools in the Royal Borough?

Councillor N. Airey responded that the question was timely as there was a report later on the agenda in relation to school places to support the BLP. The Royal Borough proposed that further work was now done to assess which schools in the borough could be expanded. As these options were developed and brought forward for

consideration in line with projected demand, the authority would continue to prioritise expansion projects at schools that were 'Good' or 'Outstanding,' are performing well, were oversubscribed, had space to expand and where those schemes offered good value for money. The council was proposing adding a sixth criteria, looking at how inclusive a school was for children with additional needs, and more details about this would be brought to Cabinet in due course. The report later in the agenda also proposed a Memorandum of Understanding for each school proposing to expand.

By way of a supplementary question, Lucas Basford asked what number of pupils would the Lead Member like to add to Holyport?

Councillor N. Airey responded that the council would look at parental preference, what worked on a site, what the school could sustain, how expansion would affect existing pupils. It was keen to expand Good and Outstanding schools. Holyport College was very oversubscribed.

Councillor Bicknell commented that 86% of schools in the borough were Good or Outstanding. If only one school was expanded, some people would have a very long way to travel therefore it was better to take a wider approach.

Councillor Dudley returned to the Chair and thanked the pupils for their questions.

FORWARD PLAN

Cabinet considered the contents of the Forward Plan for the next four months and noted the changes that had been made to the plan since the last meeting. In addition it was noted that:

- The item 'Partnership Opportunity with Mencap in Dedworth' originally scheduled for December 2017, had been withdrawn.
- The item 'Local Housing Crisis' would be considered by Cabinet in December 2017, subject to the agreement of the Chairman of the relevant Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

CABINET MEMBERS' REPORTS

E) BUDGET PREPARATION 2018/19

Cabinet considered a progress report on preparations for the 2018/19 budget.

The Chairman commented that, unlike the national government, local authorities had to balance their budgets and could not borrow for revenue expenditure.

The Lead Member explained that the report was being brought three months earlier than normal to allow for full scrutiny. He complemented all involved in putting it together. The current financial year was set to end with £2m of unallocated funds unspent. The indicative budget for next year proposed to use £700,000 of this to ensure a balanced budget. £4m was budgeted for investment in frontline care and to continue to appropriately reward staff and provide for pensions. This was largely offset by continuing efficiencies and savings. The indicative budget included a £350m capital programme, starting this year but running through to 2026 to support delivery of the

BLP. The council's projections were that the programme would be fully funded from receipts from the regeneration sites in Maidenhead owned by the borough.

There was an indicative need to raise council tax by 1.95% and an Adult Social Care levy of 3%. The recent LGA peer review had highlighted the strong and professional financial management of the council. The proposed budget was set to continue this trend. The Lead Member explained that the report was for noting other than one approval of the education capital programme, to enable advanced procurement arrangements.

The Chairman highlighted that 65% of the council spend each year was on vulnerable children and older members of the community requiring adult social care. There were 145,000 residents in the borough. Over 40% of council tax was spent to support 2500 older people. He referred to the graph contained within the main report that showed the plan for investment in infrastructure and the repayment of £60m debt and a pension fund deficit of £75m.

The Lead Member highlighted that the Overview and Scrutiny Panels had been generally supportive of the proposals, but had asked a number of questions. He confirmed that parking charges had been set through a benchmarking exercise with towns such as Reading, Wokingham and Slough for Maidenhead, and Bath and York for Windsor. The exercise showed that charges in the borough were substantially lower than the benchmark in comparable locations. Residents with an Advantage Card would see no increase in parking charges. There were some car parks without Advantage Card machines however in some of these locations residents benefitted from discounts as they were members of the sports clubs that the car parks supported. The council would explore the ability to use the Advantage Card in as many car parks in the borough as possible.

In response to comments from Corporate Services O&S Panel, the Lead Member explained that the next version of the report would include a distinction between those savings that had already begun and those that were to be actioned. It would be important for Lead Members to pay attention to any capital programme item put forward by a Ward Councillor or Parish Council that had not been included in the programme for the next financial year. Lead Members should have a discussion with the relevant party because in some cases it was anticipated that the scheme would be included in the next financial year or be funded in a different way. Following O&S comments, the Lead Member had agreed to review charges at the coach park and Stafferton Way, sex shops, racecourses and items associated with the Gambling Act,. The Executive Director would look at all these issues and ensure responses were provided to the relevant Panel. Councillor Jones had requested further detail in relation to the Adult Social Care levy. A detailed schedule would be appended to the next Financial Update report to Cabinet.

In response to a question whether any of the changes would affect services to residents, the Lead Member explained that there were effectively two budgets. The revenue budget funded through council tax fuelled the day to day services and had to balance. Therefore the council had to continue getting more for less and only raise additional council tax to meet the needs of residents. The expectation was that demand for adult social care would continue to rise. In the current year there had been a notable increase in the number of young children requiring care. In relation to the capital budget, the council had to be innovative and smart. Where there were opportunities to generate significant capital receipts, the capital would be redeployed

in providing infrastructure requirements. This would ensure the next generation had the services it needed and were not left with a large debt.

Councillor D. Evans commended the transparency of the capital programme. The council would be borrowing to make investment therefore the council needed to stick to its plan and be clear with residents that the plan was baked and the council had the determination to follow through on its commitments. He highlighted that parking charges at Stafferton Way were being raised from £5 to £6, whereas a comparable station car park at Reading charged £20.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet:

- i) Notes the report and progress made towards building the 2018/19 budget.**
- ii) Approves the 2018/19 schools capital programme detailed in paragraph 4.6 and appendix D.**

A) COUNCIL PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK QUARTERS 1 AND 2

Cabinet considered the latest performance report. The Principal Member highlighted that 16 indicators were on target; 8 were just short and 1 was off target. Going forward, operational KPIS would be considered by the relevant Overview and Scrutiny Panel.

Members noted that an externally commissioned residents survey would be undertaken on an annual basis. The survey would be accompanied by a full communications campaign to ensure good representation. Previously the survey had been undertaken by asking questions at the end of calls into the CSC, but this had been a very narrow sample. Results were expected in June 2018; the Chairman asked if this could be brought forward.

The Principal Member confirmed that the operational KPIs should have been included in the paperwork for the Corporate O&S Panel; he would ensure they were included for the next meeting. The direction of travel for a number of KPIS was downwards. The PMF was designed to highlight any such problems and develop performance improvement plans to address the issues. The plans were drawn up with lead officers and Lead Members. If any Lead Member felt they were not sufficiently aware he would be happy to help in the process. The Chairman requested that the next report include the Improvement Plans for off-target KPIs as an appendix. The O&S Panels were welcome to request the attendance of a Lead Member to discuss any off target indicator.

The Principal Member explained that a KPI relating to the number of affordable housing units being applied for would be difficult to monitor as the council had no control over the number of planning applications put forward. However, he would discuss with the Lead Member.

The Lead Member for Highways referred to the KPI 'Number of days of roadworks on highways saved' as this was off-target. The commentary explained that it was expected to be on target by the end of the year.

It was noted that the performance management report went to O&S Panels on a quarterly basis and Cabinet twice a year.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet:

- i) Notes the progress towards meeting the council's strategic priorities.**
- ii) Requests the Managing Director provides progress reports of key activity and outcomes to the service specific scrutiny panel, in line with appendix 2.**
- iii) Requests the Managing Director, in conjunction with Lead and Principal Members, to progress improvement actions for indicators that are currently off target.**

B) DELIVERING NEW SCHOOL PLACES FOR THE BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN

Cabinet considered the borough's strategy to meet the likely impact of the emerging Borough Local Plan on the demand for school places in the borough.

Councillor Bicknell assumed the Chair for the item.

Councillor N. Airey explained that the report set out the educational infrastructure that would be needed for the 14,000 extra homes described in the emerging Borough Local Plan by 2032/33. The paper set out the council's analysis of and approach to meet that demand. Modelling, set out in the report, suggested that there could be a need for a total of 8,900 places over the next 15 years, with the first places needed in September 2019, 2020 and 2021. This equated to 20-22 new classes in each year group from the youngest in Reception year to post 16 capacity. The analysis was based on the housing trajectory within the BLP and updated pupil yields based on the current population of the borough. Table 1 in the report set out the resulting expected shortfall of school capacity. The modelling based on historically high levels of birth rate and 86% of schools judged Good or Outstanding suggested the council could lower the surplus place policy from 10% to 5%.

Members noted that meeting this level of demand would require the development of new schools in addition to the expansion of existing schools. A desktop exercise had been carried out to assess the capacity of the existing school estate and an initial version of this was published in the borough's Infrastructure Delivery Plan in May 2017. Five new school sites had been identified in the BLP and it was assumed that these sites would be home to new Free Schools in line with government policy.

The report indicated a budget cost of £277m to deliver the places and a 5% surplus, a new SEND school, some early years capacity and the existing £33m investment in secondary school expansions. Funding came from various sources: Free school funding, government Basic Need Grant, CIL/S106 and other capital receipts. This was modelled in future financial planning projections.

The council now needed to move forward and plan to meet with any school interested in expansion or new site options and were earmarking £1.3m of the capital cost to support early feasibility work so that credible and financially viable options could be established ready to be brought forward once the housing developments set out in the BLP came about.

The council was also setting out a policy of requiring all parties to sign a Memorandum Of Understanding (MOU) clearly setting out the terms of any school expansions. This would ensure clarity and transparency across all negotiations while allowing council officers to explore any options and ideas that were generated to meet the likely need.

The report provided the latest projections, with action needed in the Windsor middle schools, where consultation was already underway, and potentially Maidenhead primary for September 2020. It was proposed that options for providing those places were investigated and reported to Cabinet in August 2018.

The borough had the aspiration for 100% of schools to be Good or Outstanding therefore no school would be disqualified from discussions about expansion.

The Principal Member for Ascot Regeneration commented that in his area residents asked about what would be done about school places linked to the BLP. He was pleased to be able to say the council had spent £1.2m on expanding a local primary school and a further £4.3m on a maths block at Charters School. The council was spending now, not just in the future.

The Lead Member for Maidenhead Regeneration and Maidenhead commented that investment was going to all areas of the borough. This was a huge step change in investment and he commended officers for their hard work.

The Lead Member explained that year on year the borough would need to match demand from new housing therefore Cabinet would receive a report every September to address the latest data.

The Principal Member for Affordable Housing and Communications commented that he was pleased that the council would be willing to discuss expansion options with all schools. The Lead Member confirmed this was the case even if expansion proposals had previously been rejected. She highlighted that one of the criteria would be the demand for places in the area.

The Lead Member for Finance commended the Lead Member for clear horizon planning. Good quality risk management would set the trajectory for a strategic response.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet notes the report and:

- i) Approves the school place planning strategy as described in the report and specifically:**
 - a. Approves the policy of seeking 5% surplus places, so that there are 5% more places than required to meet demand at intake (Years R, 5, 7 and 9).**
 - b. Approves a policy requiring all parties to a school expansion (partially or fully funded by the borough) to sign a Memorandum of Understanding setting out the terms of that expansion.**
 - c. Requests an annual report on school place planning, to include the latest pupil projections and any actions required to meet the resulting demand. This will be considered by Cabinet annually,**

following submission of the pupil projections to the Department for Education in late July

- ii) Requests an options assessment and feasibility works in relation to:**
 - a. New primary school places in Maidenhead for September 2020.**
 - b. New school places arising from the emerging Borough Local Plan.**

(Councillor Dudley remained in the room but took no part in the discussion or voting).

D) LOCAL AREA SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS AND DISABILITIES (SEND) WRITTEN STATEMENT OF ACTIONS

Cabinet considered twelve objectives, to be achieved between December 2017 and July 2018, which would create a transparent and accountable system to ensure that all children and young people with special educational needs and/or disabilities were appropriately supported to achieve their goals over the coming years.

Councillor Bicknell assumed the Chair for the item.

The Lead Member explained that on 1 September 2017 Ofsted and the Care Quality Commission had published a letter following the inspection of the area's services for young people with additional needs.

The local authority, Clinical Commissioning Group, schools, health providers and representatives of the Parent Forum (PACiP) had worked together to develop an action plan to address the issues identified in the inspection. The paper set out the intended impact of the Written Statement of Action which had been signed off by a multi-agency group and submitted to Ofsted earlier in the week. The multi-agency group, chaired by a Director of the East Berkshire Clinical Commissioning Group would meet regularly over the next year to monitor progress and report to the Health and Wellbeing Board in addition to Cabinet and other agency leadership boards.

Cabinet received a report on the issues in September 2017 and Children's Overview and Scrutiny had been monitoring progress.

Sections 2.11 to 2.23 of the report set out the twelve things that people would see and experience differently as a result of the actions that were set out in the statement of action. They could be grouped in the following areas:

- Making sure there were clear expectations for all, including co-producing an Inclusion Charter for young people and families, making the Local Offer, parent engagement and promotion 'everyday business,' developing an Annual Trends report and establish an Annual Inclusion Summit.
- Making sure that there was capacity and clarity about the process for Education, Health and Care plans, including refreshing the EHCP process, investing in expert resources to manage complex EHCP cases and ensure multi-agency quality assurance takes place and establishing a 'preparing for Adulthood' pathway with additional capacity within the local authority team.

- Making sure that there was capacity and clarity about the way schools worked with families and young people, including establishing an inclusion quality mark for schools and colleges, investing in the expert resources to bring the inclusion quality mark to life and using the SENCO network.
- Work together to develop services and that help all young people make progress by completing the consultation on the SEND Strategy and developing a multi-agency, implementation working party.

The council and health partners had met to consider a bid for £450,000 over the next three years to fund the additional resources required to implement the inclusion quality mark and develop the capability to manage complex cases better through the Better Care Fund. All schools were being consulted on providing a £416,000 fund for pupil focussed services aligned to the strategy. This had been recommended by the Schools Forum and a decision was due in early December 2017.

The Principal Member for Maidenhead Regeneration and Maidenhead commented that this was a very important paper to address the needs of the most vulnerable students. It was noted that the report would be brought back to Cabinet every 6 months, and quarterly to the Health and Wellbeing Board.

The Director of Children's Services confirmed that there were currently 870 young people in the borough with an EHCP although the number fluctuated. This represented just under 2% of the school population. Approximately 17% of pupils needed additional help. The number was increasing nationally. Budgets were getting harder therefore anything that could be done early would help.

The Lead Member for Finance commented that some governing bodies were actively engaged and others were not. He asked how the whole of the education network could be encouraged to appreciate the shared obligation and to share good practice. The Director explained that resources from the BCF were in place to build on the successful model used to address the pupil premium. Clarity of expectations would be important, therefore the idea of an inclusion mark had been brought in.

The Principal Member for Neighbourhood Planning, Ascot and the Sunnings commented that Charters had a big centre for pupils with SEN. She was now aware of similar centres in primary schools. The Director explained that there were a number of such units, for example at Riverside Primary. Many schools also had nurture groups. There was just as much investment in primary as secondary.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet:

- i) Notes the Written Statement of Action which has been submitted to Ofsted.**
- ii) Approves a consultation process to finalise the area-wide SEND Strategy and Inclusion Charter for the borough, culminating in an Inclusion Summit to take place before the end of March 2018.**
- iii) Approves the submission of a joint bid with East Berkshire CCG to the Better Care Fund to secure £150,000 per year for three years to fund the resources that will support improved inclusion in mainstream schools and resolve the most complex cases in a timely way.**

- iv) **Endorses the recommendation of the Schools Forum that schools agree to transfer 0.5% of the Schools Block funding to the High Needs Block for 2018/19 to provide additional support for pupils included in mainstream schools.**

(Councillor Dudley remained in the room but took no part in the discussion or voting).

C) SCHOOL ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS 2019/20 AND CO-ORDINATED ADMISSIONS SCHEME 2019/20

Cabinet considered approval to consult on the admission arrangements for borough Community and Voluntary Controlled schools including one proposed change to reduce the Published Admission Number (PAN) for Alwyn Infant School from 101 to 90. The Lead Member explained that the local authority had a statutory duty to determine the admission arrangements for community and voluntary controlled schools for the academic year 2019/20 by 28 February 2018. To meet that duty the council must consult on any proposed changes, which this year included the intention to reduce the published admission number for Alwyn Infant School from 101 to 90.

The school was required to comply with infant class size legislation which required at least one qualified adult to every 30 pupils. The school was likely to be attended by less than 90 pupils in all year groups from September 2018, however if a handful of pupils were to arrive across all year groups, the school would have to appoint three teachers which would expose the school to a significant financial risk. The school could expand again in the future without consultation as no physical space was being taken away by the movement.

The council also had to run a coordinated scheme for pupils starting or transferring school at the start of a new phase of education for example moving from year 6 in primary to year 7 in secondary. With almost 80% of applications now being done online, from September 2018 the council would confirm allocations to those applications using email only, saving on printing and postage of about 4,000 letters.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet notes the report and:

- i) Approves public consultation on the RBWM Admission Arrangements set out at Appendix 1.**
- ii) Delegates authority to the Lead Member and Director for Children's Services to approve and thereby determine the revised admissions arrangements by the 28 February 2018 deadline.**
- iii) Approves, and thereby determines, the RBWM Co-ordinated Admissions scheme for 2019/20 set out at Appendix 2 by the 1 January 2018 statutory deadline.**

F) FINANCIAL UPDATE

Cabinet considered the latest financial update.

The Lead Member requested it be recorded in the minutes that he was a Cookham Parish Councillor, but he had no need to declare an interest in relation to the first recommendation.

The Lead Member confirmed that the anticipation remained that at year end, the council would have £2m of allocated expenditure unspent.

The Lead Member for Culture and Communities expressed her support for the SLA with SportsAble; the council wished to encourage and support the work the organisation provided. The Chairman echoed the comments and welcomed an SLA with clear deliverables.

The Principal Member for Neighbourhood Planning, Ascot and the Sunnings commented that she was pleased Cookham wanted to develop a Neighbourhood Plan.

Councillor D. Evans left the meeting at 8.35pm.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Cabinet:

- i) Notes the Council's projected outturn position for 2017-18 and mitigating actions to address service pressures.**
- ii) Approves an additional revenue budget of £50,000 p.a. for three years for a service level agreement with SportsAble, as detailed in paragraph 4.14.**
- iii) Approves a £20k capital budget to support Cookham Parish Council in developing a Neighbourhood Plan.**

The Chairman highlighted that 37 young people would be participating in the Children's Takeover Day at the council the following day. He thanked the headteacher, Mr Boyle, for hosting the meeting.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 - EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting whilst discussion takes place on item 8 on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 1-7 of part I of Schedule 12A of the Act.

The meeting, which began at 6.30 pm, finished at 8.42 pm

CHAIRMAN.....

DATE.....