

AT A MEETING OF THE BOROUGH COUNCIL held in the Desborough Suite, Town Hall on Tuesday 28 July 2015

PRESENT: The Mayor, (Councillor Mrs Eileen Quick), Councillors Michael Airey, Natasha Airey, Malcolm Alexander, Christine Bateson, Malcolm Beer, Hashim Bhatti, Phillip Bicknell, John Bowden, Paul Brimacombe, Clive Bullock, David Burbage, Stuart Carroll, Gerald Clark, John Collins, David Coppinger, Carwyn Cox, Simon Dudley, David Evans, Lilly Evans, Marius Gilmore, Jesse Grey, Geoffrey Hill, David Hilton, Charles Hollingsworth, Maureen Hunt, Mohammed Ilyas, Lynne Jones, Richard Kellaway, John Lenton, Paul Lion, Philip Love, Ross McWilliams, Marion Mills, Gary Muir, Nicola Pryer, Jack Rankin, Colin Rayner, Samantha Rayner, Wesley Richards, John Story, Claire Stretton, Lisa Targowska, Leo Walters, Simon Werner, Derek Wilson, Ed Wilson and Lynda Yong.

Officers: Alison Alexander, Mark Blackshaw, Edmund Bradley, Andrew Brooker, Elaine Browne, Catherine Dover, Richard Ellis, Simon Fletcher, Dean Graham, Elizabeth Hambidge, Christabel Shawcross, Karen Shepherd and Anna Trott.

PART I

19. **PRAYERS**

Reverend Quick said prayers for the meeting.

20. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors George Bathurst, Andrew Jenner, Sayonara Luxton, Asghar Majeed, MJ Saunders, Hari Sharma, Derek Sharp, Shamsul Shelim and Adam Smith.

The Mayor highlighted to all present that the meeting was being audio-recorded by the council. She explained that members of the public could record or film the proceedings but that if they wished to do so, they should indicate so that any members of the public not wishing to be filmed could be moved to an appropriate area. No members of the public indicated that they wished to film proceedings.

21. **MINUTES**

Councillor Dudley explained that, as requested at the last meeting by Councillor Werner, the recording had been checked in relation to his statement about the popularity of Holyport College and the amendment to the minutes. Councillor Dudley read out a verbatim record of the section in question:

‘Both Manor Green School and Holyport College are both extremely popular schools with significant amounts of pupils wanting to go there. I think statistically on a first preference basis Holyport College is the most popular school in the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead (secondary school). On all preferences it was approaching 11 times oversubscribed at year 7 which clearly for the benefit of all those parents who want to get their pupils in there now have that opportunity.’

Councillor Werner agreed that the wording reflected what Councillor Dudley had said at the meeting, although he believed it to be factually incorrect. The minutes of the meeting held on 24 April would be amended to reflect this wording.

The minutes of the meetings of the Council held on 23 June 2015 were approved, subject to the following amendment:

- p.8 to read 'The minutes of the meetings of Council held on 28 April and 26 May 2015 were approved subject to the following amendment.....'

22. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Bicknell declared a personal interest in the item 'Petition for Debate' as his son was Director of sport at Holyport College. He stated that he was not biased and fully intended to take part in the discussion and voting. He remained open-minded; he would consider this exactly as for any other school in the borough.

Councillor Dudley declared a number of personal interests in the item 'Petition for Debate' as a co-founder and Chair of Governors at Holyport College. He was also a founder and Governor at Forest Bridge School and Chair of Governors at Riverside Primary and Nursery. His wife was a co-founder and Governor of Holyport College and a Governor at Furze Platt Senior School. As in all matters here and in his capacity as a member of Cabinet he kept an open mind and acted in the best interests of the residents of the borough.

Councillor Coppinger declared a personal interest in the item 'Petition for Debate' as a Governor of Holyport Primary. He had actively encouraged the headmistress to apply for the funding.

Councillor D Wilson declared a personal interest in the item 'Petition for Debate' as a Governor at Desborough College

Councillor Mrs N Airey declared a personal interest in the item 'Petition for Debate' as a Governor at Oakfield First School.

Councillor Mrs Bateson declared a personal interest in the item 'Petition for Debate' as a Governor at Charters School and Heathermount School.

Councillor Ilyas declared a personal interest in the item 'Petition for Debate' as a Governor at Furze Platt Infant School and as his son attended Manor Green School.

Councillor McWilliams declared a personal interest in the item 'Petition for Debate' as a Governor at Cox Green Secondary School, which he himself had also attended as a pupil.

Councillor Targowska declared a personal interest in the item 'Petition for Debate' as a Governor at Riverside Primary and Nursery School.

Councillor M. Airey declared a personal interest in the item 'Petition for Debate' as a Governor at St Edwards RC First School.

Councillor Mrs Jones declared a personal interest in the item 'Petition for Debate' as a Governor at Kings Court First School.

Councillor Hill declared a personal interest in the item 'Petition for Debate' as a Governor at Oldfield Primary School.

Councillor Rankin declared a personal interest in the item 'Petition for Debate' as a Governor of Windsor Royal Free Foundation which helped Princess Margaret, St Edwards and Queen Anne Schools.

23. PETITION FOR DEBATE

An e-petition containing 1611 signatories had been submitted to the Council on 16 July 2015. In accordance with the provisions of the Council's Constitution, it was requested by the lead petitioner that the petition be reported to, and debated at, a full Council meeting.

The petition read as follows:

"We the undersigned petition the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead to (1) revoke the decision made on 28 April 2015 to grant £480,000 of developer funding to Holyport College; (2) revoke the decision made on 28th April 2015 to advance council funds to Holyport College before any developer funding has been received from the Stafferton Way development; (3) share developer funding fairly between maintained borough schools likely to be impacted by those developments to which the payments relate".

The petition was introduced by the Director of Children's Services. She explained that the debate related to a development of 271 dwellings located off Stafferton Way in Maidenhead and the decision the Council took, in April 2015, as to how the contributions made by the developers were spent. New housing developments generated more people, and more people meant that more infrastructure was required to support the development. In order for a planning application to be acceptable, developers were required to contribute towards the cost of this extra infrastructure. The contributions, allowed by legislation, were commonly known as Section 106 contributions. Section 106 contributions were negotiated between the local authority and the developer. The funds collected must be spent on a scheme that increased the capacity of a school to admit more pupils. On 6 April 2015 legislation came into effect which restricted the ability to collect Section 106 contributions.

Previously, local authorities were able to pool the monies from a number of new developments to pay for, say, a new classroom. This freedom to pool was crucial because 70% of education contributions from new developments were for £15,000. In addition, although previously a local authority had to name a school, or group of schools, as the recipient of the funding, it did not have to identify a specific scheme. Since April 2015 it had to identify both the school, the scheme on which the money would be spent and demonstrate why that development made that scheme necessary. The council had, therefore, lost flexibility. The local authority could now only collect Section 106

contributions where it could identify a specific, named, deliverable, scheme at a local school or schools that resulted in additional capacity over and above the existing pupil admission number.

The Harrow Estates development at Stafferton Way was the first development considered by the Borough under the new legislation. Officers considered a range of possible schemes, including some submitted by schools and some based on Asset Management Plans that the local authority had and knowledge from previous discussions with the schools. Schemes at seven schools were identified as being eligible under the new Section 106 criteria. The scheme for adding 48 extra places over and above the pupil admission number at Holyport College was given priority because it was a specific scheme directly providing extra places, increasing the admission number at a school in the area. It also made sense to identify the largest scheme in this list, to maximise the amount of Section 106 contribution secured from the developers.

As the council focussed negotiations on the Holyport scheme, it secured more than three times the amount of possible contribution than the next possible scheme which was Furze Platt Senior School. Of course, it was successful in also securing Furze Platt contributions during negotiations with the developer. Bearing in mind the new limitations the Holyport College scheme and the Furze Platt scheme were the right decisions.

At the point that the council decided Holyport College would be included as a scheme and the Council paper was prepared Holyport College Headmaster was sent a letter, dated 24 March 2015, notifying him that the school was being named as a scheme and of the proposal going to Council. This letter went out at this point for a very important reason, so that there was an opportunity for the College to offer additional places from September 2015. The last formal day for offering places was 30 March 2015. This letter allowed the school to tweet that it could offer additional places.

The Director of Children's Services commented that it was also worth remembering that this was only the first Section 106 agreement involving education under the new regulations. There would be others, which would bring investment to other schools. The council would ensure that in the future all such decisions would be reported to the Children's Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel to add clarity and transparency. Indeed the Borough recently negotiated legal agreements with a developer of services under £100k which, if agreed, would help expand The Windsor Boys' School and a further negotiation was likely to take place with a second developer.

To answer the points raised in the petition:

(1) The Director of Children's Services continued to support her previous recommendation to Council in April 2015, which was policy compliant and made in an open and transparent manner in accordance with the necessary procedures. For Stafferton Way, the developer would not accept pooling and the risk would be that no education contribution would have been secured. The monies successfully negotiated in the s106 agreement therefore could only be used for Holyport College.

(2) Capital resources should be made available to Holyport College so that the new places would be available for September 2015.

(3) The approach of sharing money between the schools was no longer an option and in breach of the regulations that had applied since April 2015.

In conclusion, the Director of Children's Services recommended that the decision to award Section 106 contributions to Holyport College should stand as decided by Council in April 2015.

Ms Lindsey Blake spoke on behalf of Catherine del Campo, the lead petitioner. Ms Blake explained that in the 16 days the e-petition was open it received over 1600 signatories. It was fair to say there was wide support for a review of the decision to allocate money to a brand new school, two and a half miles away from the development. Signatures had been received from residents across the borough, of all political viewpoints. A good proportion of those who had signed the petition had also likely voted the council into power. The council claimed that it had already answered our questions but Ms Blake was of the view that they had been left with more than they had started with. For example, at the public meeting on 13 July 2015 it was said that the requirement for no pooling came from the planning team, then it was said that it came from the developer and then that the planning team and developer had come up with the restriction together. The developer had since stated that it had been dictated by the borough as was normal practice.

In relation to the fast-tracking of the money, Ms Blake quoted the Director of Children's Services as saying 'Why wait? The school is willing and able to accept more pupils from September 2015, allowing us to offer more children places at a school they wish to attend'.

Ms Blake then referred to the minutes of the governors meeting of 19 March 2015, chaired by Councillor Dudley, which showed that the changing rooms were not adequate for the planned admission in September. The public had been told that the funding was to aid additional expansion yet it turned out the changing rooms were not fit for purpose and the funding was just a lifeline to Holyport College.

Ms Blake stated that a Freedom of Information request for Holyport college's plans and submissions had been unanswered. A code of conduct complaint, which should have been responded to within two weeks had not been answered, more than six weeks later. Ms Blake asked why the council was neglecting its responsibilities? Objectors had been told questions would only be answered face to face, yet only a handful of people had been invited to the last meeting. Some people had tried to engage with councillors on social media only to be blocked or named as trolls. Ms Blake stated that objectors were not in opposition to free schools, they were just ordinary people not happy with the way the council had acted. Some actually worked at free schools and were passionate about changing lives. She hoped the council was aware of the strength of feeling on this issue.

Councillor D. Wilson, Ward Councillor for Oldfield, commented that some of the concerns raised were factually incorrect. The regulations in relation to section 106 had come into effect on 6 April 2010. The government at the time stated councils would have to phase out section 106 within four years, but since then there had been a number of amendments. One of these was to extend the time to 6 April 2015. Under the National Planning Policy Guidance, infrastructure payments could only be pooled for up to five projects. This was crucial as prior to 6 April 2015 section 106 could name individual

schools needing funding. After 6 April 2015 this was no longer possible therefore negotiations between the developer, the planning department and the education department. It was agreed with the developer that one project would be funded initially (Holyport college). Subsequently, schemes for Furze Platt Senior and The Windsor Boys' School had been identified. There was no requirement to subdivide further. If there was not enough money in the pot the project could not progress and there was only a 3-5 year window to spend the money.

The Director of Children's Services confirmed that a date had been set for a second meeting (4 August 2015 at 6.30pm). She would need to speak to the developer if they were now giving a different view of negotiations.

Councillor Burbage thanked those that had raised the issue of how council tax payer money and develop funding was spent. He stated that the council intended to review its policies and procedures, taking into account a wide range of issues to ensure parents and children received the best choice of schools. There were few stronger words than fairness. County councils were currently demanding fairness as their allocation was often lower than that for metropolitan areas. The Director of Children's Services and Councillor D. Wilson had both described how the funding had been allocated and a detailed note had been circulated to this effect. The council would seek to further engage with school communities through participatory budgeting which would clearly identify popular support for projects. The details needed to be worked through in time for inclusion in the 16/17 budget. It would take some of the decisions out from behind the desks at the town hall and into the hands of the school community.

Councillor Burbage also signalled his support for the motion submitted by Councillor Werner later in the agenda. It was only right that schools were fully engaged in developer contributions discussions at the right time. Councillor Burbage stated that he had supported expansion on 28 April 2015 as Holyport College was statistically the most over-subscribed secondary school in the borough. He did not believe it to be fair to constrain school places at a school so many were seeking to attend as this would reduce choice. On first preference basis, Holyport College was 323% oversubscribed for year 7 in September 2015. It would not be fair to remove or delay the decision for all those that had been offered places. The council would not respond to the petition in a way that would deny places to those who had been offered places for September. The council would continue to seek to expand over-subscribed schools, but he promised that the council would also review funding policies so that future allocations are fair and seen to be fair.

Councillor Burbage proposed the following motion:

- i) Endorse the extant decision from April 28th to expand Holyport College for 48 extra pupils
- ii) Endorse funding arrangements to ensure places are available for Borough residents from September 2015
- iii) Review, update and publish developer contribution funding policies in line with updated S106 and Community Infrastructure Levy arrangements
- iv) Propose that a proportion of the Borough School Capital Funding be subject to a participatory budgeting exercise with effect from 2016/7

Councillor Mrs Jones stated that she had serious concerns about the process that took place culminating in the recommendation to Council. Holyport College was added to the secondary schools expansion program in December by Cabinet, on the basis that, as she had been told at Children's Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel, the school would have to meet the criteria (including a full Ofsted inspection resulting in a 'Good' classification) before any expansion could take place.

Holyport College was informed in March by RBWM that they could expand by 48 places across the school after being named as recipient of S106 funding. Places were then offered based on this information. On 28 April 2015 Council was told that Holyport had been named as the recipient of £480,000 section 106 funding and that planning permission had been approved in March 2015. This was factually incorrect and it was now obvious that the writer of the report was supplied with incorrect information regarding the status of the planning application and the legal Section 106 agreement. Council was also told that not to provide upfront funding would prevent already agreed expansion.

Councillor Mrs Jones stated that she personally raised the concern that the expansion was not taking place in an area of greatest demand within Maidenhead; the response was that Holyport was the most popular school secondary in RBWM. In a letter to the press it was stated that the Council was unanimous in awarding the S106 funding to Holyport. There was a unanimous vote to add the S106 funding to the council's Capital Program but according to the report the S106 allocation to Holyport was a 'done deal' and to not support the proposal would delay already agreed expansion. As far as she was concerned neither the S106 allocation nor the decision to expand was subject to a Council vote and to imply that it was misleading. Councillor Mrs Jones proposed that the decision taken at full Council on 28 April 2015 was set aside and reviewed in full at the next Council meeting; the reason being that Council had based its decision on substantive incorrect information that would have influenced the outcome of the vote.

Councillor D. Evans stated that he was, as of the previous week, Chairman of the Children's Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel. He assured Ms Blake and other members of the public that the council did not consider them as the opposition. He had met some of those in objection and they were mothers, fathers, grandparents and teachers who wanted the best for the children of the borough. Councillor D. Evans explained that he was on the council because he was passionate about education. He had voted in favour of expansion in April 2015 as this gave parents greater choice. However, as a member of the Overview and Scrutiny Panel, he had questioned why the decision had not been scrutinised and this should have been done if the opportunity had been available. He apologised for the fact this had not been done but he requested that the motives of those who took the decision not be impugned. He welcomed the proposals to review the policy. It was important to focus on giving parents as much choice as possible. He would have no problem with supporting Councillor Werner's motion later in the agenda. Councillor D. Evans reminded all that 60% of pupils in the borough attended good or outstanding secondary schools. In neighbouring authorities the figure was 80% and that gap needed to be bridged together. He urged all to come along to future Overview and Scrutiny Panel meetings.

Councillor Werner commented that this was not a party political issue; he had spoken to supported of all sides who had expressed concern about the decision. He was not against giving funding to free schools or academies. At the moment the number of local government schools was reducing and all would probably be academies by 2020. It would therefore be ridiculous not to provide them with funding. The 14-page document referred to stated what decisions had been taken but not how, by whom and who was consulted. The concern was over the transparency of the decision. One of the biggest issues was the supposed popularity of the school. On a first preference basis, Furze Platt Senior was most popular with 262, Newlands Girls' School was second with 183, and Holyport College third with 142.

Councillor Werner felt that the 14-page document raised more questions than had been answered. Academies did not automatically give asset plans to the local authority so effectively academies were being excluded from section 106 funding. It was still not clear how the section 106 formula would work and he welcomed a full review. He hoped the recommendations from Councillor Burbage and his own motion later in the agenda would move the position forward. Councillor Werner requested that the recommendations be voted on separately. He also stated that he seconded Councillor Jones' motion.

Councillor Beer stated that the section 106 agreement was not concluded until 5 June 2015 and the planning approval was not concluded until 19 June 2015 yet on 28 April 2015 Members were told all these things had been tied up. The information presented to Council was misleading. He proposed a motion that this be referred back and sorted out in a 'start again' fashion. He also questioned the urgency of the decision as the planning application needed to go before the Secretary of state given it was development in the Green Belt. He was unaware as to whether the Secretary of State's decision had been made, hence the urgency had been grossly over-stated. If the development did not go ahead, the council would have to pay out of its own funds, a risk the council should not be facing.

Councillor Brimacombe commented that he had been a substitute at the Maidenhead Development Control Panel in April that had considered the application. At that time he did realise that there would be a debate between developers on one side and the planning department on the other over the amount of money that would need to be provided by the developer. The arbitration of this was covered by regulations. Clearly there was now a dynamic situation. At the time this came through, it was on the cusp of changes. It was clear that had a different option been taken the council would have got less money for the benefit of education in the borough. He welcomed the recommendations from Councillor Burbage.

Councillor McWilliams wished to focus on the principles behind the decision rather than the process. As a local authority, the council believed in higher standards for all. He asked those present to imagine they were a parent wanting to send their child to a good or outstanding school and the council had decided to expand an underperforming school. It was not fair that only those that could afford to move to an area with a good school were able to attend one. Parents did not have the time to wait for schools to improve. Councillor McWilliams highlighted that Cox Green had recently received a good rating as a result of commitment and tough choices. He was in no doubt it would soon be oversubscribed. Competition and autonomy had forced the school to up its game; this was driven by parents wanting choice.

Councillor Dudley commented that irrespective of their views, everyone cared deeply about the education of children in the borough. He had set up two schools in the borough and was the governor of a school in a deprived area of his ward. He wanted to see every child receive the quality of education his children had enjoyed. He believed in equality of opportunity and the way to do this was to improve schools by working together. The council could not fix this with money alone. The most important people were the teachers, and governors who needed to make schools appealing to parents. The council would work with all schools to achieve this.

Councillor Dudley referred to a letter he had received from a pupil at Holyport College explaining how much she loved the school. The child's mother had contacted his wife via social media as she had been upset over the issue. Councillor Dudley stated that all needed to be very careful as to how they conducted themselves on social media, including not trolling teachers.

Councillor Dudley concluded that he knew all with sincere intent wanted to improve borough schools. A great number of them had some distance to go, which was why parents sent their children to grammar and independent schools.

Councillor Bicknell commented that the council had expressed its desire to support all schools in fair funding. It was clear that in this particular case the council was right to agree with the officers' recommendations in regard to Holyport College receiving the £480,000 to increase their pupil numbers by 48, 24 of which would start in September. Officers both in the planning department and education department did a very good job in securing legal agreement for development 106 funding and he publically thanked them for their efforts.

Education officers were in regular contact with all schools in regard to their estates and expansion plans but it really was a skill to identify the schemes which a developer would agree to fund which also increased the capacity of a school to admit more pupils in a fairly short time frame. This was the first scheme under the new regulations of April 2015, but as the Director of Children's Services said at the beginning "there will be others". He had chaired Windsor Planning Panel the previous week where the Panel had agreed to a new development near to Windsor Bridge which would yield £99,000 for expansion at The Windsor Boys' school.

Councillor Bicknell was hopeful that the country was well on its way to a new prosperity in the UK and there would be more development in and around the Royal Borough. This should lead to more support to existing schools in their quest to provide excellent education and more school choices for parents through the council's support for free schools and a satellite grammar, national legislation permitting.

Having heard the debate Councillor Bicknell was confident that councilors and officers were endeavoring to support all schools in a fair and transparent fashion, to assist them in delivering the very best exam and vocational outcomes for each individual pupil as possible. He looked forward to the day when all schools in the borough had attained a good or outstanding Ofsted report.

It was proposed by Councillor Burbage, seconded by Councillor Bicknell, and:

RESOLVED: That Council:

- i) Endorse the extant decision from April 28th to expand Holyport College for 48 extra pupils**
- ii) Endorse funding arrangements to ensure places are available for Borough residents from September 2015**

(Councillors Michael Airey, Natasha Airey, Malcolm Alexander, Christine Bateson, Hashim Bhatti, Phillip Bicknell, John Bowden, Paul Brimacombe, Clive Bullock, David Burbage, Stuart Carroll, Gerald Clark, John Collins, David Coppinger, Carwyn Cox, Simon Dudley, David Evans, Lilly Evans, Marius Gilmore, Jesse Grey, Geoffrey Hill, David Hilton, Charles Hollingsworth, Maureen Hunt, Mohammed Ilyas, Richard Kellaway, John Lenton, Paul Lion, Philip Love, Ross McWilliams, Marion Mills, Gary Muir, Nicola Pryer, Eileen Quick, Jack Rankin, Colin Rayner, Samantha Rayner, Wesley Richards, John Story, Claire Stretton, Lisa Targowska, Leo Walters, Derek Wilson, Ed Wilson and Lynda Yong voted in favour of the motion. Councillors Malcolm Beer, Lynne Jones and Simon Werner voted against of the motion.)

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Council:

- iii) Review, update and publish developer contribution funding policies in line with updated S106 and Community Infrastructure Levy arrangements**
- iv) Propose that a proportion of the Borough School Capital Funding be subject to a participatory budgeting exercise with effect from 2016/7**

24. MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS

The Mayor submitted in writing details of engagements that she and the Deputy Mayor had undertaken since the last meeting, which were noted by the Council. The Mayor commented that she had had the opportunity to support many organisations and advise where other funding could be found for smaller groups. If any group wished to invite the Mayoralty to an event, she encouraged them to contact the Mayor's Secretary.

25. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

- a) Lindsey Blake of 27 Duke Street, Windsor, asked the following question of Councillor Bicknell:

Why did Children's Services choose to award £480,000 to Holyport College on 13th March when at that point they had no asset management plan from the school and did not know what physical projects the money would be spent on?

Councillor Bicknell responded that Children's did not make the decision without the relevant information.

Ms Blake, by way of a supplementary question, commented that the 14 page document supplied by David Scott clearly stated the decision was based on 48 extra places on an

average of £10,000 per place and later that day Holyport College to supply what projects they were actually going to spend that money on. She asked whether that was correct?

Councillor Bicknell responded that it must be correct but he did not understand the relevance of the £10,000 with the chasing. His understanding was that Holyport College was the only school approached to see if they were still looking to undertake an expansion at a cost of £480,000.

- b) Lindsey Blake of 27 Duke Street, Windsor, asked the following question of Councillor Bicknell:

If the works outlined in the subsequent brief from the school cost less than £480,000 what will happen to the additional money, and if they should come to more than £480,000 who will be liable for this remainder?

Councillor Bicknell responded that any unspent monies would go back to the developer. Any budget overspend would be the responsibility of the school.

Ms Blake confirmed that she did not have a supplementary question.

- c) Bethan Osborne, on behalf of Malcolm Burt of 9 Camperdown, Maidenhead asked the following question of Councillor Burbage, Leader of the Council:

How does Councillor Burbage reconcile his statement in the Maidenhead Advertiser that RBWM should not expand coasting schools with handing £480K for expansion to a school with no track record or Ofsted report?

Councillor Burbage responded that coasting schools were ones defined in 2014/15 that had 5 A*-C pass rates at GCSE of below 60%; in 2014/15 had a below average proportion of pupils making expected progress in English and Maths between Key Stage 2 and Key stage 4; and in 2016 a below standard score on the progress 8 score. Clearly this did not apply to Holyport College as it was a new school and no exams were taken in 2014. If it subsequently became a coasting school by that definition, he was sure the council would not wish to expand it further.

Bethan Osborne, on behalf of Mr Burt, by way of a supplementary question, said that Councillor Burbage had been quoted as saying Holyport College was a fantastic school. This may be his opinion but the public had to trust that the council was making objective decision rather than subjective decisions. In the absence of any objectivity, how could he justify that the council was operating transparently?

Councillor Burbage responded that he knew from what he had seen and heard. The school had also been looked at by the council's School Improvement Team who also believed it to be good. Subsequent to the decision, Ofsted had found the boarding provision to be good. By the weight of people trying to get into the school it was only right it should be expanded to provide more school choice for local borough parents.

- d) Bethan Osborne, on behalf of Malcolm Burt of 9 Camperdown, Maidenhead asked the following question of Councillor Burbage, Leader of the Council:

COUNCIL – 28.07.2015

How will RBWM deal with the obvious on-going problem of the conflict of interest created by having lead councillors as founders of free schools in the borough. As long as this continues there will always be questions about the way funds are allocated to these schools?

Councillor Burbage responded that from the declarations it was clear that there was a great deal of involvement by councillors in borough schools. Elected representatives could talk with a great deal of experience for the decision that they then had to take in meetings. The time they put in was totally voluntary and in the interests of the community. The council had a code of conduct to follow and a very clear position enabling members of the public and the media to hold the council to account. There was also a process of getting rid of bad councillors. He felt that Councillor Dudley was a good councillor who had helped open a school benefitting the borough.

Bethan Osborne, on behalf Mr Burt, by way of a supplementary question, asked how could the electorate trust councillors to do the right thing for the young people of this community when they were more intent on helping out their friends?

Councillor Burbage responded that he took exception to the allegation. He was in fact favouring the most popular oversubscribed secondary school.

e) Brian Millin of 41 Priors Way, Maidenhead asked the following question of Councillor Derek Wilson, Lead Member for Planning:

At a public meeting on 13/7/15 to discuss residents' concerns over the selection of Holyport College as the only initial recipient of S106 monies from the development at Stafferton Way, the Director of Children's Services stated the decision was not one made by RBWM but had been imposed by the developer, corrected to a joint decision between developer and RBWM.

Given it is not a legal requirement to stipulate only one project who in planning decided on this policy in this instance and why?

Councillor Wilson responded that the decision to negotiate for one or two projects was taken collaboratively between the DC Manager, S106 Officer and Case Officer taking account of the changes to legislation that took place in April 2015. In deciding why only one project, officers concluded that naming one or two projects was the best way of ensuring that the contribution was acceptable under the legislation and ensured a project could be delivered. There was too much of a risk of splitting the contribution into too many projects which would mean that none could be delivered and the funds would in the end have to be returned to the developer.

Mr Millin, by way of a supplementary question, commented that it had been stated by the Director of Children's Services that it had been dictated by the developer. He asked if this statement was therefore incorrect?

Councillor Wilson responded that the information he had had been verified by planning colleagues therefore was the answer he had given.

26. PETITIONS

No petitions were presented.

27. BUDGET DECISIONS: FUNDING LEISURE CENTRE CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015/16

Members considered a request to add to the 2015/16 Capital Programme £650k (£200k funded from s106) to finance the Leisure Centres capital programme for 2015/16. Councillor Dudley explained that £200,000 of that figure would come from section 106 funding. He explained that in the arrangements with Parkwood Leisure the council retained the freehold of the centres and was therefore responsible for their condition. Members noted the financial details in section 4 of the report.

In relation to the Magnet Leisure Centre, Councillor Dudley explained that work was ongoing about the possible future replacement as the centre came to the end of its current life. It would be important not to spend more than was necessary to maintain it in good condition in the meantime.

Councillor Werner stated his concern that he did not have enough information to support the proposal. There had as yet been no consultation with residents about the replacement of the Magnet leisure centre and there was some doubt as to whether there would be enough space at Braywick anyway. Over the last eight years the Magnet had become grubbier and he questioned whether enough was being spent on its upkeep. Without seeing details of what would be included he did not feel he could vote.

Councillor Bicknell commented that he had visited the Magnet the previous weekend with his family as the Windsor centre had been full. He had found the Magnet to be clean and well-maintained.

Councillor Burbage wished for it to be put on record that Councillor Werner was against the expansion of schools and also the upgrading of leisure centres. Councillor Werner responded that he actually felt more money should be spent but he could not vote without knowing the facts.

The Mayor wished to comment as previous Lead Member with responsibility for leisure services. The survey had been looked at by both the borough and the contractor to ensure all buildings were in a good condition. Both the two main leisure centres were regularly in the top 10 in the country. She had visited all four and had been very pleasantly surprised by the cleanliness, friendliness of staff and the state of the equipment.

Councillor Dudley agreed that there would be a significant amount of work and public consultation needed on the new leisure centre idea. Councillor Ms Stretton explained that the council was taking a pragmatic approach and investigating all options for a new leisure centre. Consultation would take place when some conclusions had been reached. The current contractor was happy with the pragmatic approach and the level of funding needed to maintain the building in the meantime.

Councillor McWilliams commented that he was happy to see Cox Green Leisure Centre would also receive funding. Councillor Mrs Bateson highlighted that three years prior the council had invested £0.5m in Charters Leisure Centre.

Councillor Mrs Jones asked whether the funding proposed was sufficient for the year. Councillor Dudley responded that things always occurred and if necessary an additional allowance could be made.

It was noted that the second point under ‘benefits to residents’ was an error that should not have been included in the report.

It was proposed by Councillor Dudley, seconded by Councillor Burbage, and:

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Council agree the inclusion of £650k in the 2015-16 Capital Programme to enable the Leisure Centre capital programme to be implemented.

28. MEMBERS QUESTIONS

a) Question submitted by Councillor Hilton to Councillor Cox, Lead Member for Environmental Services

What action does the Lead Member propose to highlight that aircraft noise generated by a third runway at Heathrow would impact upon 550,000 people, 25 times more than an additional runway at Gatwick which would affect 22,000 people, and that this statistic alone is a compelling reason not to proceed with a 3rd runway at Heathrow?

Councillor Cox, responded that Members would be aware that Cabinet confirmed its support for the option for expansion at Gatwick on the basis of the economic benefits, fewer people being impacted by noise, less environmental impact and a quicker and fully financed implementation plan. He confirmed that the council was categorically against the development of a third runway at Heathrow. Councillor Hilton had in his question raised the major noise issues that residents would face. The numbers stated in the question were significant and alone were a compelling reason for no further expansion at Heathrow, but, this was just one of a number of detrimental impacts that any such development would have on our area. Air quality, increased traffic and congestion and significant planning constraints were further examples of environmental impacts that expansion at Heathrow would bring to our area.

This was a serious issue for the borough and one that the council would continue to champion on behalf of residents. A group of senior managers were meeting later in the week to set out the council’s strategy and actions over the coming months to highlight concerns to government.

It was important however to understand that the council had no regulatory or enforcement jurisdiction in respect of aircraft noise. These powers were held by the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA). The Royal Borough was however majorly involved in lobbying Government, the CAA, Heathrow Airport and the Airports Commission to ensure residents’ voices were heard and their interests protected in respect of noise and future decisions and developments that involved Heathrow.

The council had submitted formal responses reflecting this position to the Airports Commission consultations and submitted statements to the Planning Inspectorate regarding Hillingdon Borough Council's refusal of a planning application by Heathrow that would ultimately result in the abolition of the Cranford Agreement and the fairer distribution of flights and subsequent noise around the airport. Elected Members from the Royal Borough had presented the council's case in person to the Davies Commission and to the Planning Inquiry in respect of these matters. The council would continue to respond to future consultation documents and relevant decisions that were made in respect of aviation that could or would have an impact on residents.

In relation to noise specifically, the council had recently replaced two aircraft noise monitoring stations, one located in Windsor Town Centre and the other in Old Windsor. These units monitored aircraft noise 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. The data captured by each unit would help inform the council's position on responses to consultations and highlight the airport's performance against the flight movement parameters/restrictions that were in place for Heathrow. The council would also be able to use this data to cross reference any complaints it received with actual flight movements and the associated noise readings.

Members would be aware that the council had a formally constituted Aviation Forum that considered this subject and also helped draft responses to consultations etc. Residents were able to attend this forum and provide input to the items being considered. The forum would continue under the new administration and would be in place to ensure residents' and the council's views were strongly put forward on the future issues associated with future aviation strategy and airport/runway capacity in the South East.

By way of a supplementary, Councillor Hilton thanked the Lead Member for clearly stating the council's position.

b) Question submitted by Councillor S Rayner to Councillor Cox, Lead Member for Environmental Services

Could the Lead Member give any indication at this time as to what further powers or functions could be extended to the community wardens?

Councillor Cox, responded that he wished to place on record his thanks for the excellent job undertaken by the community Wardens. In addition to their more obvious role of addressing crime and disorder issues in the community, the community wardens already fulfilled a very wide range of functions supporting officers in all directorates. These ranged from safeguarding matters for Children's and Adult Services to supporting Streetcare on vegetation overhanging the highway, and Parking on enforcement.

In the medium-term future the council would be investigating whether community wardens could issue Fixed Penalty Notices (FPN) for failing to comply with a Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) for example if the council established a PSPO banning BBQs in an area, wardens would be able to issue FPNs to those breaching the order.

Wardens were already patrolling in the Nigh Time Economy on Friday/Saturday and, Saturday/Sunday , investigating issues across a broad range of council functions including

Environmental Protection and Trading Standards, but they would be specifically assisting licensing on taxi checks and issuing parking tickets where appropriate. They would report policing issues into the control room.

The council was currently investigating Thames Valley Police accreditation, the unbudgeted costs for which were probably around £6,000. If the council should wish to pursue this route there are many powers the Wardens might be able to adopt, which included:

- Issue of FPNs for cycling on the footpath / power to stop cycles
- Confiscation of alcohol
- Confiscation of tobacco from under 16s
- Power to issue fixed penalty notices in respect of offences under dog control orders
- Power to require giving of name and address
- Power to control traffic

By way of a supplementary, Councillor Mrs S Rayner commented that the community wardens were the link between residents and the borough and she commended to work they did.

c) Question submitted by Councillor D Evans to Councillor Burbage, Leader of the Council

Could the Leader of the Council set out what steps he is taking to bring to an end the legal merry go round in respect of the illegal traveller site at Shurlock Row?

Councillor Burbage responded that the council had been trying to remove the unauthorised camp since 2009. He had recently written to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government highlighting the time and money spent so far with no tangible outcome. The specific part of the merry go round was the Court of Appeal which had still not determined the extant application for permission to appeal the judicial review and injunction from some time ago. The letter had also been copied to the Justice Secretary.

By way of a supplementary, Councillor D Evans thanked the Leader for continuing to pursue the issue. The judicial review had been turned down on 28 January 2015; six months later the council was still waiting for the Court of Appeal's decision as to whether it was minded to hear the appeal.

d) Question submitted by Councillor C Rayner to Councillor Cox, Lead Member for Environmental Services

What measures are the council taking to reduce the effects of night time culture on the residents of Windsor?

Councillor Cox, responded that the council currently implemented a number of activities linked to the effects of the Night Time Economy across the Royal Borough. Targeted night-time economy enforcement operations formed a cornerstone of the Licensing team's

activities. In addition, a night-time economy pilot focussed on providing enforcement services to deal with issues arising from the night time economy

Focussing more on licensing strategy, he explained that Cabinet had previously debated ways to progress a campaign to enable more flexible legislation and had agreed to support the Local Government Association campaign "Open for Business: Rewiring Licensing" and a Private Members bill calling for the introduction of a public health objective to be included in the Licensing Act. A positive response from the Home Office had stated that RBWM's views would help in developing future government policy, particularly in relation to the public health objective.

The council continued to work with relevant partner agencies to ensure any adverse impacts arising from licensed premises were investigated and dealt with in a robust manner. Members would be aware of the Mantra nightclub in Windsor and the collaborative efforts of the council's enforcement officers and Thames Valley Police to deal with the way in which the premises was being operated and the impact it was having on local residents in Windsor. The premises licence was ultimately called in for review and the operating hours and activities were seriously curtailed. As a result, the premises had been closed for the past 3 months.

The current licensing regime did enable the potential impact of the night time economy to be managed to a much greater degree than the previous licensing system. For example nightclub closing hours could be staggered across a town in order to mitigate the potential for mass groupings on public streets at the same time and enabling a greater ability to manage the safe and controlled egress from a night time economy location.

Officers would continue to work with their counterparts to ensure the night time economy locations and establishments within the Borough were effectively managed.

By way of a supplementary, Councillor Rayner asked whether it was acceptable for nightclubs to open all night. Was 2am not late enough?

Councillor Cox, responded that it depended on the location; opening times should not necessarily be restricted if there was no detrimental impact on neighbours. He highlighted that the draft licensing policy included consideration of limits on future applications for nightclubs.

e) Question submitted by Councillor Rayner to Councillor Cox, Lead Member for Environmental Services

Can the Lead Member confirm the application of our parking enforcement policy under circumstances when Community First Responders make life threatening calls in heavily restricted parking areas and ask officers to work with CFRs to develop vehicle displays / signage that may help enforcement officers and CFRs establish a practise whereby parking tickets in these circumstances can avoid being issued?

Councillor Cox responded the council and the parking enforcement operation did not seek to hinder the effective operation of what was a very important voluntary service providing care to patients until an ambulance can attend an incident. He had tasked the Head of Community Protection & Enforcement Services to work with St John Ambulance

and South Central Ambulance Trust to develop a solution that would enable Community First Responder's vehicles to be easily identified by Civil Enforcement Officers. Officers would of course look to avoid the issue of penalty charge notices where a CFR was attending an emergency incident and their vehicle could be identified. He would of course write to Councillor Rayner once the appropriate officers from each organisation had met in order to provide an update.

By way of a supplementary, Councillor Rayner commented that there were some CFRs in the audience. He knew that those in Horton and Wraysbury had saved lives, for which he was thankful. He had donated his Member Participatory budget funding to the Wraysbury group.

f) Question submitted by Councillor E Wilson to Councillor Burbage, Leader of the Council

Has the Leader of the Council noticed that there are now no shops in Dedworth that are available to rent and will he accept an invitation to come to Dedworth and see how we can continue to support businesses in our area?

Councillor Burbage, responded that the survey showed historically low levels of retail vacancy in Dedworth, which was a sign of a vibrant local economy. The Borough Local Plan would set out policies to support local centres such as Dedworth, and to protect individual shop units from being lost to other uses where they fulfil a community function. He would be happy to visit Clewer North and Clewer South to see what plans local councillors have for the area.

By way of a supplementary, Councillor E Wilson commented that there was a renewed sense of optimism in the area; it had been served well by the previous Ward Councillors. It would be good to see the Leader in the area to explore ways to support businesses.

Councillor Burbage accepted the invite.

29. MOTIONS ON NOTICE

a) By Councillor Dudley:

Councillor Dudley introduced his motion. He explained that council tax itself was a regressive tax. This was recognised by the council which tried to help the poorest in the community by reducing the level of tax. Councillor Dudley referred to a recent Green Paper on the future of the BBC and highlighted the following statistics:

- There were 25.4m licence holders in the UK.
- 153,000 people were convicted of television licence offences in 2013/14, 28% of which were single parents.
- 10% of all magistrate court cases related to television licences.
- 32 people were currently in prison for non-payment

Councillor Dudley commented that these people may not even be watching the BBC. In his view the licence was a legal machine driving court appearances and fines.

Councillor Dudley commented that as a result of the rise in the tax free allowance, 3.7m people would be taken out of the tax regime altogether. However, irrespective of whether they watched the BBC or not, they would still be required to pay £145.50 for a colour licence. He estimated that approximately 4500 people in the borough did not pay tax but were required to pay the television licence.

Councillor Brimacombe commented that recommendation i) was right as a criminal record was a blight on an individual's future. For a trivial offence this was bad for society. Over the last ten years there had been significant technological changes in television viewing. The BBC's principle of informing educating and entertaining was still cogent and its reputation worldwide was undisputed. However its organisation, funding and audience was in an incredibly dynamic situation. It was wrong to rely on a historical tax backed up by the criminal justice system. He suggested that the Secretary of State be encouraged to look for more creative ways of dealing with the superb institution.

Councillor Werner commented that getting rid of the tax would get rid of the BBC; he felt it was important to be honest about that fact. If the BBC became subscription-based or included adverts it would cease to be what it was now. In terms of practicalities, 11m households used Freeview boxes, of all of which would need to be replaced, affecting the poorest in society the most. The quality of the BBC was higher than in other countries. Councillor Werner questioned whether a commercial station would take risks on popular programme such as 'Strictly Come Dancing'? The creative sector was one of the fastest growing in the economy, and was dominated by the BBC. It also played an important role in providing competition to commercial channels.

Councillor McWilliams commented that many of the issue raised by Councillor Werner had been addressed in the Green Paper. All models of funding were being looked at; it was not about scrapping or selling off the BBC. It was important that a modern institution took into account technical innovation.

Councillor Mrs Jones stated that she could agree with recommendation i) in terms of decriminalisation but could not support recommendation ii) unless was something put in place to ensure the continuity of the BBC

It was proposed by Councillor Dudley, seconded by Councillor Bicknell, and:

RESOLVED: That this Council:

- i) supports the Conservative majority government's plans to decriminalise non-payment of the TV licence fee**
- ii) calls upon the Secretary of State for Culture, Media & Sport to go further and abolish this regressive tax**

(Councillors Michael Airey, Natasha Airey, Malcolm Alexander, Christine Bateson, Hashim Bhatti, Phillip Bicknell, John Bowden, Paul Brimacombe, Clive Bullock, David Burbage, Stuart Carroll, Gerald Clark, John Collins, David Coppinger, Carwyn Cox, Simon Dudley, David Evans, Marius Gilmore, Jesse Grey, Geoffrey Hill, David Hilton, Charles Hollingsworth, Maureen Hunt, Mohammed Ilyas, Richard Kellaway, John Lenton, Paul Lion, Philip Love, Ross McWilliams, Marion

Mills, Gary Muir, Nicola Pryer, Eileen Quick, Jack Rankin, Colin Rayner, Samantha Rayner, Wesley Richards, John Story, Claire Stretton, Lisa Targowska, Leo Walters, Derek Wilson, Ed Wilson and Lynda Yong voted in favour of the motion. Councillors Malcolm Beer and Simon Werner voted against of the motion. Councillors Lilly Evans and Lynne Jones abstained.)

b) By Councillor D Wilson:

Councillor D Wilson introduced his motion. He explained that he had proposed a similar motion in 2009 to commemorate the 70th anniversary of World War Two. Sir Nicholas Winton was a hero who had lived in the borough. It was with great sadness that he had recently passed away. Aged 29 he had evacuated 669 children from Czechoslovakia and it was important that this was remembered. His efforts had gone undiscovered until the late 1980s when his wife found a scrapbook providing all the details. In the last year Sir Nicholas had received the highest honour from the Czech Republic, the Order of the White Lion. He had been knighted in 2003. Councillor Wilson urged that it something appropriate came up in the future, the council should support it to recognise Sir Nicholas's work.

Councillor Burbage commented on a discussion he had recently heard on the train from Paddington about the statue on Maidenhead station. He had been able to inform the person where to look to see the statue. Councillor Burbage commended Councillor Wilson for his motion in 2009 which had led to the statue being installed. He endorsed the current motion.

Councillor M. Airey endorsed the motion and commented that he had recently had the privilege of meeting Sir Nicholas Winton at an event held to honour him by the Czech and local rotary associations. Councillor Cox commented that the word hero was used too often. Sir Nicholas Winton was truly a hero who had had moral courage at a very young age. Councillor Mrs N. Airey fully endorsed the motion and highlighted the importance of teaching the next generation of Sir Nicholas Winton's courageous actions. She would work with the Director of Children's Services to ensure such heritage was taught in schools.

The Mayor commented that the day after his death, a Czech television crew had visited the Town Hall; the Royal Borough had therefore been able to send a message of high regard back to the Czech Republic. She endorsed all the comments made by others.

Councillor Brimacombe commented on Sir Nicholas Winton's moral courage to act with no direct benefit to himself. He also had the confidence to pull it off. It was important that the values he stood for were taught to borough children.

Councillor Beer agreed with all the comments made. He suggested opening the idea of what could be done to commemorate Sir Nicholas Winton's work to the public. He suggested a statue could be placed outside the Town Hall. Councillor Ms Stretton said she would take this up in her role as Principal Member for Culture and Communities.

It was proposed by Councillor Wilson, seconded by Councillor Burbage, and:

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That this Council pays tribute to Sir Nicholas Winton who sadly passed away on 1 July 2015 and is committed to ensuring that his extraordinary life and achievements both locally and internationally are suitably honoured by the Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead.

CONTINUATION OF MEETING

At this point in the meeting, and in accordance with Rule of Procedure Part 4A 23.1 of the Council's Constitution, the Mayor called for a vote in relation to whether or not the meeting should continue, as the time had exceeded 10.00pm.

Upon being put to the vote, those present voted in favour of the meeting continuing.

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the meeting continue past 10.00pm.

c) By Councillor C Rayner:

Councillor Rayner introduced his motion. He explained that the Highways Agency (HA) proposed to spend £8m on Bisham roundabout. He was of the opinion that the HA needed to hear the views of residents and parish councils to ensure a scheme was devised that would actually work. The three proposals did not help the situation.

Councillor Kellaway, as Ward councillor, commented that there were a number of pinch points on the route and there was no point solving the Bisham roundabout problem if traffic was still stopped at Handy Cross roundabout or Junction 8/9 of the M4. The main difficulty for local people was crossing between Bisham and Maidenhead at peak times. Making it easier to cross would increase traffic through Bisham, which would not be popular with residents.

Councillor Werner stated that he supported the motion as none of the three options would work. They would also have a major effect on Pinkneys Green. He had asked residents to respond to the survey to say 'none of the above'.

Councillor Beer reported that the issue had been discussed at both the Local Access Forum and the Cycle Forum. All had agreed none of the three options were suitable and would be a waste of money. A flyover or underpass were the only options, but they would be more expensive.

It was proposed by Councillor Rayner, seconded by Councillor Kellaway, and:

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That this Council:

- i) Urges Highways England to explore further options for the Bisham Roundabout on the A404 that are not currently being consulted on, such as a flyover on the single carriageway A308;**
- ii) Reinforces its commitment to close working and consultation with local communities, including Parish Councils, in its representations to Highways England on this issue;**
- iii) Encourages Highways England to carefully consider the open landscape and impact on the Green Belt as well as the needs of cyclists, pedestrians and horse riders in any of its future work to develop solutions for the roundabout.**

d) By Councillor Werner

Councillor Werner introduced his motion, which he had put forward to ensure a similar situation did not happen in the future. The motion would formally give a fair funding commitment to all schools in the borough and add transparency to any decisions.

Councillor Burbage suggested adding the word 'eligible' to recommendation ii), an amendment which was accepted by Councillor Werner.

It was proposed by Councillor Werner, seconded by Councillor Dudley, and:

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That, to demonstrate its commitment to fairness and transparency and allow all publicly funded schools to have equal opportunities to access developer contributions, this council will:

- i) Formally contact all publicly funded schools in the borough that could benefit when developer funding is or is likely to be available;**
- ii) Contact those eligible schools at the same time without preference, giving reasonable timescales for their responses;**
- iii) Set out clear eligibility criteria to access those funds and provide a clear public audit trail of the process.**

30. SENIOR MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS.

It was noted that this item had originally been listed on the agenda in Part II, but had been moved into Part I.

Members considered designating the duties of Managing Director (MD) and Head of Paid Service to Alison Alexander for a fixed term period of two years less one day.

Councillor Burbage placed on record his thanks to Christabel Shawcross who had undertaken the duties of Interim Managing Director since 1 January 2015. He thanked her for her support and services over the last seven months, seeing the council through a period of Director changes, an election and a new administration. The Mayor gave her personal thanks to Christabel Shawcross for her support when she was a Lead Member and during the first months of her mayoralty.

Members noted that following a tough interview process, Employment Panel had recommended the appointment of Alison Alexander.

It was proposed by Councillor Burbage, seconded by Councillor Hollingsworth, and:

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That:

- i) Council approve the designation of the duties of Managing Director (MD) and Head of Paid Service to Alison Alexander for a fixed term period of two years less one day. The appointment to commence on 29th July 2015 and will cease on 27th July 2017.**

ii) Council approves an additional duties allowance of £10,543 per annum to be paid to Alison Alexander for the period she is designated as Managing Director and Head of Paid Service. This allowance will cease either on 27th July 2017 or earlier if Alison Alexander resigns or ceases to be Managing Director and Head of Paid Service.

(Councillor Werner was not present for the vote on the item).

31. LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 – EXCLUSION OF 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 took place on item 12 on the grounds that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 1-7 of part I of Schedule 12A of the Act.